239

A LETTER

FROM

Dr. *Payne* to the Bishop of *R*---

IN

VINDICATION

OF HIS

SERMON

ON

Trinity Sunday.

[W:] P[ayne]

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Cumberland*, at the *Angel* in St, *Paul's*-Church-Yard, 1696

20 2 + 16 3 2
(1), 25 (+ 23 pages without numbers), 30 p.

A LETTER, &c.

My Lord,

I Was amazed at ſuch a *Letter* as I received from your Lordſhip, and ſome of my Brethren:—I aſſure your Lordſhip, I have as hearty Deſigns to ſerve God, and Religion, and the Church too, as any of you, and aim'd at nothing elſe in my Sermon, but to vindicate Chriſtianity, and our common Faith, from the bold Objections of ſome modern *Deiſts* and *Socinians*, and particularly from a late Book called, *Chriſtianity not Myſterious*. I perceived at our firſt Meeting, that few of my Brethren then preſent, had troubled themſelves with thoſe things, or with the reading thoſe ſorts of Books, ſo much as my ſelf, and therefore could not ſo well Judge either of the manner how, or the reaſon why, they ſhould be anſwered: When I am ſatisfied that it is for the Honour of God, and the Service of Chriſtianity, as well as for the peace and ſafety of the Church, not to conſider or anſwer our Adverſaries, but to let them

write on, and triumph on the ruins of our Chriſtian Faith; I will take up, and live by the wiſe and quiet rules of the Monk, (whether of *Wirtenberg* or *Weſtminſter*) not to trouble my ſelf or the World with impertinent Studying, or Writing, but to go oftner into the Cellar, or the Refectory, than into Library. But I was unhappily put upon examining, and managing this Controverſy, as formerly the Popiſh, by my Superiors of the greateſt Note and Eminence; and my preſent Lord of *Canterbury* lately deſired me to anſwer the fore-mentioned Book of Mr. *Toland's*, and 'twas againſt this I chiefly directed my Sermon, and that with a deſign to publiſh it. In order to theſe ends I applied my ſelf to conſult, and read carefully the beſt Antiquity, from whence I have taken all my Thoughts and Notions about thoſe Matters; and this I ſuppoſe to be the beſt Method, to take the Controverſy as it lies there, before it fell into the Hands of Nice School men, who perplex and entangle every thing. I am very willing to learn further of my more

more learned Brethren of *Weſtminſter*, but am loath to be injured by the Miſtakes and Miſunderſtandings of any, and indeed of One or Two of them, from whence your Lordſhip and others have received ſome miſtaken Accounts, and undue Prejudices againſt my Sermon on *Trinity Sunday*; they, it ſeems, had drawn up a Paper, and were order'd to write to me, and to acquaint me with thoſe things that were objected againſt it, and this was a fair and right Method; and ſince you were not ſatisfied with what we talked, as I thought you had, I deſired this might be purſued; but upon this, your Lordſhip and they thought fit, for ſome ſecret Reaſons, to alter theſe Meaſures at another Meeting, which had been agreed on before; ſo that I cannot have the favour to get a Copy or ſight of that Paper, but am inform'd by thoſe who ſaw it, that 'tis about theſe Three things, The Quotation out of Biſhop *Pierſon*, the word *Equivocal*, and ſomething about *Specifical* and *Numerical Eſſence*; which latter was never men-

tion'd

Theod. Abucara, *quoted by Bishop* Pierson, *and to be found in* Bibli. Patr. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes.

Ὅθεν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ πᾶσα ἁγία γραφὴ, ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ θεὸς, ὅτως ἀπλούτως, καὶ ἀπροσδιορίστως καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ παν σὺν ἄρθρῳ καὶ χωρὶς ἰδιώματος ὑποστατικῦ, τὸν πατέρα δηλοῖ.

Ἰατρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ μονὸς ἀληθινὸς θεὸς, ὁ ἀγέννητος, ὁ τῶν ὅλων κυριὸς, τὸ δὲ μονογενὲς πατὴρ καὶ γεννήτωρ.

Iren. *L.* 5.

Et sic tenus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus, super omnia quidem Pater, & Ipse est Caput Christi.

Athanas. contr. Sabel. Gregal. ----ad Adelp. ----ad Serap.

Εἷς θεὸς, ὅτι καὶ πατὴρ εἷς.

Μονὸς θεὸς, ὅτι μόνος ἀγέννητος, καὶ μόνος πηγὴ θεότητος.

Καὶ ὅπως εἷς θεὸς ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ κηρύττεται ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, ἐπὶ πάντων μὲν ὡς πατὴρ, ὡς ἀρχὴ, καὶ πηγὴ.

De Sp. Sancti Basil. Orat. 27. contra Sabell. Greg. Naz. Orat. 29.

Οὐ δύο θεοὶ οὐδὲ γὰρ δύο πατέρες, ὁ μὲν ἀρχὰς εἰσάγων δύο, δύο κηρύττει θεούς.

Εἷς μὲν θεὸς εἰς ἦν αἴτιον καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματος ἀναφερόμενον.

Epiphan. Haeref. 57.

Οὐκ ὁρᾷς ὅτι εἷς θεὸς ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πῶς τὴν μίαν ἀρχὴν σημαίνει.

Eusеb. de Eccl. Theol. *l.* 1. *c.* 11.

Εἰς ἂν γένοιτο θεὸς μονὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ μόνος ἀναρχος, καὶ ἀγέννητος τὴν θεότητα ἰδικὴν κεκτημένος, αὐτὸς τῷ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ τοιῶδε εἶναι γεννητὸς ἄπιος.

Ib.

Οὗτος εἷς θεὸς ὁ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ πατὴρ.

Id. *l.* 1. *c.* 17.

Ἡμῶν μεμαθηκότων ἕνα γνωρίζειν θεὸν, αὐτὸν τε εἶναι θεὸν ὁμοῦ, καὶ πατέρα υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς.

Id. *l.* 2. *c.* 7.

Πάντων δ' ὁ πατὴρ ὢν ἀρχὴ καὶ ῥίζα τῶν ἀγαθῶν εἰκότως εἷς καὶ μόνος ἀναφερεύοιτο ἂν θεός.

Ambros. de dignat. Con. Hu.

Ideo autem dicitur Deus Pater quia ipse est ex quo——

Hilar. de Trin. *c.* 1.

Non enim Patri adimitur quod Deus Unus est, quia & Filius Deus sit, ob id unus Deus quia ex se Deus.

August. de Trin. *l.* 6. *c.* 9.

——Tanquam hoc insinuare voluerit, (Joh. 17. 3. quâ solus Pater verus Deus est.

——Hinc

tion'd in Diſcourſe, but only the Two former; I ſhall therefore endeavour to give you full ſatisfaction about thoſe.

1. As to the Firſt, The Quotation out of Biſhop *Pierſon*, to charge that as unfaithfully made, which it ſeems was done, is to queſtion not only my Honeſty, and my Underſtanding, but even my Eye-ſight too: The Words were theſe, *The Name of God taken abſolutely, is often in Scripture ſpoken of the Father, and* in many Places *is to be taken particularly for the Father,* —— and *from hence he is ſtiled One God, the True God, the Only True God; and this,* he ſays further, *is a moſt neceſſary truth, for the avoiding Multiplication and Plurality of Gods,* he laying the Unity mainly here, as I have done; tho' I take in alſo Unity of Eſſence and Eſſential Perfections, and of inſeparable Emanation from the Father, and inexiſtence in one another. I did not wonder at other Cavils made againſt my Sermon, when I heard of that made againſt this Quotation: Any one that has Biſhop *Pierſon* on the Creed by him, may examine whether thoſe Words

he:

Bull. Defens. Fid. Nican. p. 433. ——*Hinc Justino, cæterisq. Scriptoribus Ante-Nicænis solenne est Deum Patrem* διακριτικῶς *appellare nunc Deum absolute, nunc unum illum Deum, nunc Deum Patrem juxta Scripturas,* 1 Cor. 8. 4. Eph. 4. 6. Joan. 17. 3.

Id. p. 438. *Deniq. veteres Deum Patrem eo quod Principium Causa, Auctor & Fons Filii sit, Unum illum, & solum appellare non sunt veriti, sic enim ipsi Patres Nicæni, &c.*

Petav. Dog. Theol. l. 3. c. 4. *Unus enim Deus ac Pater omnium appellatur,* Ep. 4. 6. *propter Originis ac Principii prærogativam.*

Calv. in Proth. Valent. Gent. Zanc. de tribus Eloh. l. 5. c. 5 *Ingenue tradimus* κατ' ὑπεροχὴν *Dei nomen Patri proprie ascribi. Patrem sic vocari Unum, & solum Deum* κατ' ἐξοχὴν *quia totius est Deitatis fons.*

Solum Patrem, & Summum Deum, utpote Deitatis fontem.

Conven. Refut. Irenic. Irenic. *Christus Filium Dei se nominavit (& Deum Patrium) & non Deum, cum nominatio Dei sit nominatio Patris Christi.*

Cardinal Cusa in Cribrat. Alcoran, l. 1 c. 11.

Flac. Illyric. Clavis Scriptur. in Voce Deus. *Observandum autem est, quod plerumq; Paulus in suis Epistolis nomen Dei Patri, Domini autem Christo seu Filio Dei tribuit. — Ideo quod in mysterio Redemptionis Patri summa dignitas ut vero Deo tribuitur. — Hæc est causa quod in Novo Testamento plerumque tantum prima Persona vocetur Deus.*

be not there, and whether the Senſe be any thing alter'd by the abreviature; but ſince a Learned Elder Brother upon my repeating thoſe Words of Biſhop *Pierſon*, ſeemed to diſlike what the Biſhop ſaid, and to ſpeak againſt it, ſo that ſo great a Man would hardly have eſcaped Cenſure, had he now Preached them; and ſince I laid ſo great a ſtreſs in my Sermon upon the ſame Notion, *That the Term God, and one God, was predicated eminently, and abſolutely of God the Father in Scripture, and that this was obſerved by a great many others, as well as by Biſhop* Pierſon, *and is a very neceſſary Truth*, as he ſays, *for avoiding Multiplication, and plurality of Gods*, and ſo for anſwering the Charge of *Tritheiſm*, I ſhall now produce ſufficient Vouchers, and undeniable Authorities for it, and give you on the other ſide, ſome of thoſe Quotations, which I did not think ſo fit to repeat in the Pulpit, and they I hope, if duly conſidered, will ſet this matter right, and clear both Biſhop *Pierſon*, and the Quo-

tation out of him, and my ſelf, and the Notion I propoſed.

2. The Second thing objected is the word *Equivocal*, this was the great Offence, and indeed it was a very high one, as charged upon me, *viz.* That I ſhould ſay that Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt, were God only Equivocally; but this is the falſeſt thing, and the greateſt Miſtake in the World; I told your Lordſhip ſo at firſt, when you mention'd it to me, and I do now moſt ſolemnly profeſs it to be ſo, even in *Verbo Sacerdotis*, ſince that has been put to me: I cannot think any of my moſt prejudiced Hearers will affirm that I ſaid thoſe Words, if they do, I am ſure 'tis not true; there are not any ſuch in my Notes, which I ſhewed and read quickly after to Your Lordſhip and Dr. *B*——, and alſo to Dr. *Br*——, at Dr. *H*——*k*'s Houſe. This I thought might have given ſatisfaction to Your Lordſhip, and to them, and I ſuppoſed it had done ſo, at the laſt Chapter juſt before I went to the Commencement. I little expected to have heard any thing more

more of this again, but in my abſence it ſeems you thought fit to renew it, and I ſhrewdly gueſs by whoſe Inſtigation, by thoſe who are of late very angry, and concern'd for the loſs of ſomething elſe, beſides the Chriſtian Faith.

But I did uſe the word *Equivocal*, and that even about the Term God, and the Trinity and Unity; and this ſounds ill, and gave occaſion to ſome of my Hearers, and eſpecially to my Two offended Brethren, as the Letter calls them, to conceive, and to collect, for it can be no more, that I aſſerted that Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt were God only Equivocally: I cannot help their conceiving or imagining, or collecting this; I am ſure no ſuch Words were ſaid by me, nor any thing from whence any ſuch Conſequence or Collection ſhould follow, or be made by them, they might as well have conceived and collected, and as truly have charged me, that I ſhould ſay that God the Father was God only Equivocally, as Chriſt or the Holy Ghoſt: There was the ſame Reaſon and

* *Dixerit forte aliquis aliter accipi vocem Deus cum singulis Personis prædicatur, aliter cum absolute ponitur; illic hypostatice sumi, seu personaliter, hic essentialiter, equidem non crediderim acutiores ex Adversariis sic responsuros.* Crellius de Uno Deo. *L.* 1. S. 1. *Cap.* 1.

Dei nomen interdum pro Persona quapiam sumi velut prima in qua Naturæ totius est principium, interdum vero Naturam significare nulla in certa persona subsistentem, sed in aliqua trium, vel in ipsis tribus vagâ, & infinitâ notione comprehensis. Petav. Dogm. Theol. *L.* 3. *C.* 3.

Dei quippe nomen alias communiter, & ἐποδῶς *alias secundum proprietatem ultimi principii, atque fontis, equo cetera personæ proficiscuntur.* Id. *L.* 3. *C.* 2.

Nomen Deus proprie ac directe Divinitatem, Naturamve Divinam indicat, adsignificat autem eandem ut in quapiam persona subsistentem, nullam de tribus expresse designans, sed confuse, & universe interdum vero Deus certam de tribus personam determinat, ut Damascen. observat. ut in Ps. 44. *Unxit se Deus, ubi Pater intelligitur.* Id. *L.* 3. *C.* 4.

Si

ground for this Charge from the word *Equivocal*, and from any thing I ſaid about it, as from the other, and it related as much to the one as to the other. What I ſaid, I read to them afterwards, *That the Word God, and his being One, and Three, and when it is ſaid, God the Father is one God, and that all the Three perſons are one God, that thoſe Terms are not to be taken in the ſame ſenſe, the ſame reſpect and conſideration, but in different, and ſo are Equivocal.* I think no Orthodox Divine of Learning and Underſtanding in thoſe matters will gainſay this, nothing being more common among them, than the word God to be taken either οὐσιωδῶς, or ὑποστατικῶς, Eſſentially or Perſonally, or ſometimes Eminently and Abſolutely for God the Father, ſometimes for the Divine Perſons together, and ſometimes for one alone. *Crellius* indeed is very angry, and diſpleaſed with theſe Diſtinctions, theſe different and Equivocal Senſes, and he had good reaſon, for they are the true and the only Anſwer to his laboured Book, *De Uno Deo*; * I ſhall put ſome of his Words, and

of

Si Pater intelligatur per Deum ſummum, Dei Nomen & Notionem uſurpari ὅλως *non* ὁλικῶς. Id. *L.* 3. *C.* 9.

Nec aliud evincunt Crelliana Sophiſmata quam quod ultro damus Catholici, non eſſe alium Deum ſummum ex quo omnia, quique ſit à nullo præter Unum Patrem. Id. *L.* 3. *C.* 2.

——*Quare ſolius, vel Unius & ſi quæ ſunt aliæ notionis ejuſdem duplicitur uſurpari poſſunt, aut ſecundum Perſonarum proprietatem, aut ſecundum communem naturam, illo modo ſolus Pater Deus eſt.* Ib.

Nam voces Jehovah, Deus, Adonai, &c. *vel ſumuntur proprie, & communiter & ſic nunquam vel Filius, vel Spiritus Sanctus diſtinguitur à Jehovah Deo, aut Adonai, vel ſumuntur, improprie, & ſpecialiter, & ſic ſæpius ponuntur pro ſolo Patre, adeoque Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus ab eo diſtinguntur. Inepte autem argumentatur, a ſignificatione vocis reſtrictæ ad communis ſignificationis excluſionem.* Biſterfield contra Crell. in Synop.

of *Petavius*'s both, upon this occaſion, on the other ſide, which will give a great deal of light to this matter, of the Term God being taken differently and ambiguouſly. Neither of my Brethren, nor your Lordſhip objected any thing againſt the word *Equivocal*, thus uſed by me, when I read the Paſſage to you, with what immediately went before, and what juſt followed after, which did ſufficiently explain my meaning about it; and this my Brother *H——k* who heard it, expreſly declared at that time; and it ſeems did ſo again at the meeting in Chapter before your Lordſhip and my Brethren then preſent, which might have ſpared you the trouble, one would have thought, of the ſevere Letter you ſent me.

The word *Equivocal* ſhould not have provoked you ſo much, which was ſo innocently uſed by me, and ſo ſignicantly as I thought, and very much to the purpoſe, *viz.* to take off the Contradiction objected to us by our *Socinian* Adverſaries, with ſo much triumph, and ſo unanſwerably as they pretend of our holding

* *Sicut in divinis non dicitur generatio univocè cum generatione que eſt in Creaturis, ſic quoad Naturam per generationem communicatam eſt ibi plusquam Univocatio, ſed quoad proprietatem perſonam conſtituentem formalitèr eſt ibi quaſi Æquicatio,* Durand. in Sentent. *l.* 1. *d.* 4. *q.* 1.

Vide Qu. 2. *Utrum Deus genuit Deum, ubi ſic Deus importat ſuppoſitum habens divinam naturam.* — *Deus eſt terminus diſcretus, et Deus eſt terminus communis* — *alii dicunt, quod hoc nomen Deus proprie loquendo, non eſt univerſale nec ſingulare, ſed habet aliquid de ratione univerſalis, et aliquid de ratione ſingularis.* — *Cum hoc nomen Deus ſtet pro ſuppoſito habente divinitatem, poteſt de eo aliquid verè enunciari pro uno ſuppoſito, et negari pro alio* — *Ubi in unâ naturâ ſunt plura ſuppoſita de termino ſignificante naturam in concreto poſſunt contradictoria verificari ratione alterius et alterius ſuppoſiti, ut hæc Deus generat et Deus non generat* — *dicendum quod verum eſt uno modo et uniformiter accepta utpote ſi referant tantum Eſſentiam vel tantum Perſonam, ſed ſi referant utramque ſimul, utrumque poteſt falſificari de altera parte.* —

Ideò

holding One God, and Three Gods, when we ſay, *The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God, and yet there is but one God*: If this be ſaid in the ſame ſenſe and conſideration, it will be very hard to get off from the Contradiction of affirming and denying the ſame thing, in the ſame ſenſe: But if the Affirmation and Denyal be not in the ſame ſenſe and meaning, but in different, which I take to be the meaning of *Equivocal*, then the Contradiction vaniſhes, and is preſently anſwered, according to that Maxim of the School-men, *Ubi eſt diverſa ſignificatio, non eſt contradictio affirmantis & negantis, Æquivocatio enim impedit contradictionem*, Aquin. S. P. 1. Q. 13. From hence I took the Hint of this offenſive word *Equivocal*, which yet is often either expreſly and litterally, or in the ſame ſenſe to be found in the School-men, and in other Divines of all ſorts, on the like Occaſion, (applyed to God and the Trinity) as I ſhall largely ſhow in the Quotations on the other ſide *, and the Pages following.

— *Ideò cum Deus in antecedenti ſtet pro perſonâ, eodem modo ſtat in conſequente relativo cum dicitur Deus quì eſt perſonaliter Pater, quod non eſt verum, aut Deus qui non eſt Pater perſonaliter, & hoc eſt verum ; et ſi inferat ergo non tantum eſt Unus Deus, non ſequitur abſolutè, quia plus negatur in conſequente quam in antecedente.* — *Si autem inferretur cum determinatione, benè ſequeretur dicendo ſic, Deus genuit Deum qui eſt Deus Pater, ergo non eſt tantum Unus Deus perſonalitèr, quod verum eſt,* Durandus in Sentent. Ib.

Nomen ſubſtantiæ æquivocatur apud nos cum quandoque ſignificat Eſſentiam, quandoque Hypoſtaſin. Aquin. S. P. 1. Q. 29.

Nec Univocè nec pure æquivocè, ſed analogicè dicitur Deus in præmiſſis tribus ſignificationibus. Id. *Qu.* 13. *Art.* 10. *Sed philoſophus largo modo accipit æquivoca* — Ib.

Nomen ſubſtantiæ eſt æquivocum nam poteſt, & naturam, & ſubſtantiam ſignificare, Suarez. T. 1. *Lib.* 3.

Propter æquivocationem vocabuli ſubſtantiæ quia interdum ſumitur pro eſſentia divina, interdum pro quocunque ente reali — Molina

Com-

Comment. in Thom. *qu.* 29. *Artic.* 2. *disp.* 1.

An essentia dicatur de Deo et Creaturis Univocè, Æquivocè vel Analogice? Q. 29. *Art.* 2. Ibid.

Alitèr se habent hoc nomèn essentia, sive Divinitas cum attribuitur personis, alitèr hoc nomen Deus, nam hoc nomen Deus attribuitur personis ut quod est, sive ut habens divinam naturam, et idco habet supponere personam; hoc vero nomen essentia attribuitur personis, ut quo persona est, Alexand. Alensis. *Sum.* P. 1. Qu. 50.

Hoc Nomen Deus nec est proprium nec appellativum, sed aliquid habet proprij aliquid appellativi, habet enim significationem proprij et suppositionem appellativi, & ita illa propositio Deus generat vel generatur, partim est singularis, et partim indefinita, Ib.

Iste terminus Deus positus in subjecto, supponit personaliter, & hoc quod significat essentiam personaliter, sed hoc modo falsa est hæc, Deus est Trinitas, Ib.

Vide Petrum Alliac. *qu.* 5. *in prim. Sentent.*

Bellarmin de Christo, L. 2. C. 7, 8.

Alteram principalem rationem quâ conatur probare vim verborum significare, Deum illum unum esse solum Patrem jam examinemus. Quamvis enim directè Responsionem nostram non petat, utpote qui concedamus, unum Deum á quo illa omnia solum Patrem esse, tamen veritatem ipsam aggreditur, nosq; statuimus rectè dici, Pater est unus Deus prout sumitur vox Deus, V. 4. — *Rationem suam dilemmate confirmat.* Hæc enim Locutio, *inquit*, "*Unus* "*ille Deus est Pater, vel est synecdochica, vel* "*propria, ita ut eâ salvâ, etiam liceat dicere,* "*unus ille Deus est Filius, unus ille Deus est* "*Spiritus Sanctus; si statuis prius contra* "*sic argumentari licebit, Deus ille unus est* "*tota Trinitas, atqui Pater est Deus ille Unus,* "*ergo Pater est tota Trinitas. Verùm hoc sophisma nititur* Æquivocatione *phraseos,* Deus ille Unus, *vel potius vocis* Deus: *Nam vox Deus sumitur vel absolutè, essentialiter, & communitèr sic, Deus est Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, vel sumiter relativè, personaliter ac restrictè, sic Deus non est tota Trinitas : Itaque licet Pater sit Unus ille Deus, tamen non est omne id, quod est unus ille Deus. Diversus autem significandi modus*

quo

quo eadem vox jam communiùs jam ſpecialiùs ſumpta ſibi opponitur etiam de alijs uſurpatur in Scripturâ. —— Biſterfield *de Uno Deo contra* Crell. *lib.* 1. *ſect.* 1. C. 2. p. 43.

Bellarminus C. 2. *de Chriſto taxat eos qui filium Dei vocant* αὐτοθεὸν, *oritur autem erroris ſuſpicio ex æquivocatione vocabuli, nam* αὐτοθεὸν *duplicem ſenſum habet* —— *Divinitatem conſiderari dupliciter ratione ſui eſſe, ratione modi habendi,* &c. Meiſneri *philoſoph. ſobr. parte* 2. *ſect.* 1. c. 2. qu. 2.

Facit tamen in Trinitate primatus originis atque ordinis —— *ut nomen Dei de Patre Antonomaſticè uſurpetur,* Vogelſang. *exercitat. Theolog.* p. 353.

Veruntamen æquivocè duo predicamenta Deo aptari ſubſtantiam & relationem, Junij *Cath. doct. de Trin. defenſ.* l. 1.

Unus eſt, inquis Samoſatene, *Deus, veriſſimum, ſed rectè intelligendum, nam et in ſubjecto et in predicato poſitæ ſunt adverſus imprudentiores tendiculæ, niſi attenderint, et ex ijs falſa concluſio adſtruitur, Deus enim aut abſolutè et indeterminatè dicitur, aut etiam determinatè, priore modo de eſſentiâ, poſterio-*

re

re de aliquâ unâ persona dicitur. Secundum priorem modum Christus dicebat Deus est Spiritus, Joan. 4. 24. Secundum posteriorem Paulus unus Pater omnium, Eph. 4. 6. Hic autem Deum absolutè & indeterminatè enuncias, de essentiâ igitur prædicatio est & ita accipimus, tu de personâ accipis Æquivocè & idem concludis contra prædicationum & argumentationum leges, Id. Def. 2.

Obj. Quod Unum est id Trinum esse non potest Deus Unus est, Deus igitur Trinus esse non potest?

R. Illudis Samosatene, tum equivocatione (ut vulgo dicitur) tum etiam elenchi ignoratione —— Æquivocationem committis cum dicis Unum, unum, inquies, ecquid minùs equivocum esse quam unum potest? tibi fortè non videtur, sed tamen si veritati credis, me demonstrantem audies, unam duobus modis dicitur, absolutè et relatè — &c. Ib. p. 78.

Ob. Non possunt contraria gradibus excellentibus in eodem subjecto simul existere, Deus autem Unum et Trinum esse tam sunt contraria quam Spiritum esse et Corpus, æternum et non æternum, Deus ergo Unus & Trinus esse non potest.

R. Ma-

R. *Majorem ut negemus abſit, ſed Aſſumptio tua æquivocatione & elenchi ignoratione fallit, eâdem planè quam in ſuperiore tuâ argumentatione reteximus.* Junii Defenſ. 2. P. 80.

Ob. *Quod expreſſum eſt imagine & imago exprimens, non ſunt idem, Chriſtus eſt imago Dei inviſibilis, Chriſtus ergo et Deus inviſibilis non ſunt idem.*

R. *Æquivocatio in nomine idem manifeſta eſt, nam aut idem eſſentia dicitur neutro genere, aut idem perſonâ maſculino.* Ib. P. 87.

Ob. *Quod ejuſdem eſt æternitatis et majeſtatis cum Deo, nihil omnino ab eo accepit, non vitam, non gloriam. Filius ejuſdem eſt* —

R. *Majorem Samoſatene de induſtriâ facis æquivocam,* — *Deum non ignoras à nobis aut abſolutè de eſſentiâ dici,* — *aut relatè de unâ aliquâ perſonâ.* Ib. P. 90.

— *Prætereà nomen Dei, quod eſſentiale, perſonaliter accipis æquivocè.* P. 91.

Ob. Marc. 13. 32. *Fallis,* — *vocis Pater æquivocatione,* — *Patris nomen hoc loco eſſentiale ac non perſonale eſt.* —— *Fefellit te et hypotheſeos et æquivocationis illius ignoratio, quam æquivocationem poſt reſurrectionem quoque ſervavit Chriſtus dicens non veſtrum eſt*

ſcire

ſcire quæ Pater poſuit in poteſtate ipſius, Act. 1. 7. Ib. P. 96.

Ad Obj. de Chriſti ſubjectione, 1 Cor. 15. 24. *ex quo Chriſtum ſibi ſubjectum fore, ſic ait omnino conſtat nomen Chriſti de perſonâ ſive in ſeſe, ſive in Myſterio enunciatum, dici æquivoce.* Ib. P. 101. & P. 182.

Antecedentis duo ſunt æquivoca, primùm enim Deus appellatur Pater, aut eſſentialiter reſpectu creaturarum, aut perſonaliter reſpectu Filij et relationis internæ, &c. Id. Defenſ. 3. P. 185.

Now that there is neceſſarily underſtood this latitude of Variety, in the ſence of ſeveral of the Words of the (*Athanaſian*) Creed, is apparent from the conſent of thoſe that do ſubtilize this Miſtery to the utmoſt curioſity, for it is impoſſible for them or any elſe to think, that the Godhead of the whole Trinity is one in the ſame ſence, that the Father conſidered alone is one, or the Son and Holy Ghoſt ſo conſidered. — So when *the Father* is ſaid *to be omnipotent*, *the Son omnipotent*, and *the Holy Ghoſt omnipotent*, it is evident that omnipotent has not the ſame ſence in all, for the Father has the power of Eternal Generation. — And the like may be ſaid of the term God; by which if you underſtand that which is firſt of all, in ſuch a ſence as that all elſe is from him, and he from none, the Son and Spirit cannot be ſaid to be God in this ſignification, becauſe the Father is not from them, but they from the Father. *More's Miſtery of Godlineſs*, Book 9. Cap. 2.

And we muſt ſtill profeſs, that we take none of thoſe words to be proper, formal, univocal terms. *Baxters Cath. Theology*, Sect. 1.

Whether alſo this might not be applyed to defend the *Athanaſian Creed*, *The Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghoſt Eternal, and yet not Three Eternals, but One Eternal,* as well as *Aquinas* his taking them adjectively, and ſubſtantively, which *Petavius* diſlikes, (being willing to allow *tres Æterni, & tres habentes Deitatem, & tres Divini*) and whither alſo in thoſe Scholaſtick Queſtions, and ſayings, *Utrum nomina Eſſentialia appropriandа perſonis, & nomina Eſſentialia in divinis concreta nonnunquam pro Eſſentia, aliquando pro una perſona, aliquando pro tribus ſupponunt.* I offer to the Conſideration of my more Learned Brethren. This I hope will, if not juſtifie, at leaſt excuſe the word; and if any of them will pleaſe to teach me a better way to take off the objected Contradiction, I promiſe never to make uſe of that word again.

But after all, could Malice it ſelf, tho' never ſo blind, if it had but Ears, and heard that Sermon of mine, charge me with ſaying, that Chriſt and the Ho-

ly Ghoſt were God only Equivocally, and not properly, truly and naturally, when I ſo often, and ſo fully, plainly and directly aſſerted the contrary, thro' the whole Sermon, and in ſeveral ſuch paſſages as theſe following, "That the "Myſtery of Chriſtian Faith lay in God "the Father's having a Son, and an Ho- "ly Spirit, diſtinct Perſons from himſelf, "the one begotten of him from all Eter- "nity, and ſo his only Son, the other "proceeding from him and the Son "both, and theſe two ſtill in the Fa- "ther, Naturally, and Inſeparably uni- "ted to him, as to the Fountain of their "being, one with him in the ſame Di- "vine Nature and Eſſence, and all three "together contriving and accompliſhing "the Redemption of mankind. — That "God the Father Almighty hath one "only begotten Son, of the ſame Na- "ture and Eſſence with himſelf, *Who "is the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the "expreſs Image of his Perſon*: And that "there is alſo a Holy Ghoſt pro- "ceeding from both, and ſent by both,

who

" who hath the Characters and Attri-
" tributes of Divinity plainly aſcribed to
" him, and who is joined with the Fa-
" ther and the Son in the Office of Bap-
" tiſm, and in the Form of Chriſtian
" Bleſſing, and againſt whom the moſt
" unpardonable ſin may be commit-
" ted.

" That the Son and Holy Ghoſt have
" the ſame Divine Nature and Eſſence
" with the Father, derived and commu-
" nicated to them. Tho' the Name of
" God taken abſolutely, is eminently
" predicated of God the Father in Scrip-
" ture, and he is called *God*, the *One*
" *God*, eminently, tho' not excluſively,
" (*To us there is One God the Father,* — *I*
" *I believe in One God the Father Almigh-*
" *ty*, &c.) yet the other two Perſons
" having the Divine Nature, and the
" Divine Attributes and Perfections be-
" longing to them, may each of them
" properly be called God, and the Di-
" vinity does certainly belong to each
" of them.

After all theſe Paſſages and Expreſſions in my Sermon, which I hope they who have not a memory only on one ſide will pleaſe to remember and owne, beſides, the whole drift and deſign of it, which was to lay down as plainly, and to vindicate as ſtrongly as I could, the Myſtery of Chriſtian Faith, and of the Bleſſed Trinity; could any fair and candid Hearer, or indeed any one without thoſe Epithets have the leaſt reaſon or pretence to charge me with aſſerting, that Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt were God only Equivocally, and not truly and properly, or could they upon hearing, and miſunderſtanding that word as applyed to the Terms God, Trinity and Unity, One and Three, God's being One in Perſon in one ſenſe, and Three in Perſon in another; could they with any more Reaſon, and not without the greateſt Miſtake imaginable, and one would think a wilful one, (tho' I am willing to think otherwiſe, having never given either of them reaſon for that) charge this as belonging

to

to Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt, and not as much to God the Father, and the whole Trinity, when I uſed and applyed this Term in general to the Name of God, his being One, and Three, being taken either Eſſentially or Perſonally, ſometimes Abſolutely and Eminently, for One Perſon ſingly, ſometimes for all the Three Perſons together, and ſo upon the account of thoſe different ſignifications theſe terms were Equivocal, Hononymous and Ambiguous, as many, I have ſhown, and particularly a Lutheran Profeſſor in * anſwer to *Crellius* had long agoe aſſerted before me, and this only to take off the Contradiction of One and Three, and to anſwer that Jewiſh, Pagan, Mahometan, Sabellian, Samoſatenian, Photinian, Arrian, Macedonian, Socinian, Muggletonian Objection of Tritheiſm, againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity.

**Homonymia in voce unus --- in vocabulo tres.* Botſac. Anti-Crellius, *Lib.* 2. *Sect.* 1. *C.* 1. *Expreſſa latet ambiguitas in voce Deus, quæ modò perſonaliter, uſurpatur modò eſſentialiter*, Id. *Lib.* 2. *S.* 1. *C.* 7.

The Father is the only ſelf-exiſtent, unoriginated Being, whom the Ancients call πηγὴ θεότητος, ἀρχὴ, ῥίζα of the other two, and ſo in the words of a Right Reverend and Excellent Perſon, *God in the higheſt ſenſe*, whom

(a) *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem.*

Orientales Eccleſiæ omnes pene ita tradunt, credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem. Ruffin. in Symbol.

Καναὼν πίστεως ——— ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ πανὸ ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποσόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν παντοκράτορα — καὶ εἰς ἕνα χριςὸν ἰησοῦν τὸν — Irenæus, *l.* 1. *c.* 2.

Cum teneamus autem nos regulam veritatis, i. e. *quia ſit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per verbum ſuum,* Id. c. 19.

—In unum Deum credentes fabricatorem Cœli et Terræ, et omnium quæ ijs ſunt, per Chriſtum Jeſum Dei Filium, Id. L. 3. C. 4.

Regula eſt autem fidei, —illa ſcilicet qua creditur unum omnino Deum eſſe, nec alium præter Mundi Conditorem, qui univerſa de nihilo produxit, per verbum ſuum primo omnium emiſſum, id verbum Filium ejus appellatum. Tertull. *præſcr. adv.* Hæreſ. C. 13.

Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus ſub hac tamen diſpenſatione, quam οἰκονομίαν *dicimus, ut unici Dei ſit et Filius ſermo ipſius, qui ex ipſo proceſſerit, per quem omnia facta ſunt.* — Id. adv. Praxeam C. 2.

Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα — καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κυριον ἰησοῦν χριςὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ. Symbol. Vetuſtiſ. Eccleſ. Hieroſ. apud Cyrill in Catecheſ. 6.

Καθώς

whom the Scriptures, Creeds, (*a*) and Christian Offices (*b*) call so absolutely, and by way of Eminence and Prerogative. The Son is produced of the Father, and so is not αὐτοθεὸς, or God in that sence, as the Father who is from none, but is *God of God*, and is *very God*, as having the Divine Nature and Perfections naturally belonging to them, but derived and communicated from the Father, as the Holy Ghost from both: So that the one is *Deus Ingenitus*, the other *Deus Genitus*, and the third *Deus procedens*; all Divines allow that the words are taken thus differently, and in these several senses and meanings, and why then may they not be called Æquivocal? Since * *Thomas Aquinas* says, *Quicquid prædicatur de aliquibus secundum idem nomen, & non secundum eandem rationem, prædicatur de ijs æquivoce.* But *Deus* as it signifies a self-existent, unoriginated Being, and is often taken in that sense only by Divines, [g] is predicated only of God the Father, and not *secundum eandem rationem*, or upon the same Account of the other two Divine Persons, nei-

*Sum. *p.* 1. *q.* 13.

g Solus Deus αὐτοούσιος, αὐτοφυὴς, αὐταυτὸς, *Gerard.* loc. com. de natura Dei. *Deum esse a seipso, hoc est neq; ab alio, neq; ex alio.* Amessij *Medul. Theol.* l. 1. *Deus qui semper est, nec habet aliunde principium ipse sui origo est, suæq; causa substantiæ.* Hieron. *in Epist. ad Eph. c.* 3. Ἀυτογενὴς, αὐτογένεθλος, οὐκ ἐκ τινὸς γενώμενος, αὐτολογευτος θεός ἀγέννετος, αὐτογέννετος. Hesych. Suidas.

Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν θεοφόρων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε τὸ λοῦτρον ἐλαμβάνομεν, καὶ καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γράφων μεμαθήκαμεν πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν — καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, — Euseb. Cæsar Confes. in Synod. Nicæn apud Socrat. H. E. *l.* 1. *c* 8.

(b) *Hæc Patris* ἐξοχὴ *in omnibus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Lyturgijs hodie agnoscitur, nam et in* ἀξιολογίαις Deum *Patrem,* ἐν πρώτῃ τάξει *(ut* Justinus *loquitur) glorificamus, et preces pleraq; ad ipsum dirigimus.* Bull. Def. Fid. Nicæn P. 208.

Veteri ex usu pleræq; preces ad Patrem referuntur, atq; ita decretum legimus in Carthaginensi tertiâ Synodo, Canone 23. ut cum ad altare assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio. Petav. Dogm. Theolog. de Trin. L. 3. C. 7.

Instabunt illi forte cum quibus nunc agimus, et dicent se idem aliquo modo statuere, Patrem enim solum ideo vocari Deum verum, quia fons sit Divinatis, ac porro quandam præ Filio, ac Spiritu Sancto prærogativam ratione Divinitatis habens, siquidem Filius, ac Spiritus Sanctus Divinam Essentiam ab ipso habeant, ipse á Nemine, quam ob causam Patrem nominatim αὐτοθεὸν *appellant, et eâ ratione Filio,*

et

neither of which are ſelf-exiſtent and unoriginated, nor God in the higheſt ſenſe of αὐτόθεος, αὐτοῖσπος, αὐτοφυὴς, αὐταυτὸς, but the one is God begotten, θεὸς γέννητος, not ἀγέννητος; and the other God proceeding, θεὸς ἐκπορευόμενος, as they are frequently called, but both properly, and truly, and naturally, and eternally God in theſe ſenſes, both having the true Divine Nature and the ſame Divine Eſſence with the Father, belonging to them, and ſo being ὁμοούσιοι with him, but yet he being the fountain of Divinity, the *Principium*, *Fons*, ἀρχὴ, ῥίζα, &c. of the other two who were produced from him, ſent by him, and ſome are not afraid to ſay ſub-ordinate to him *, is called eminently and abſolutely, and by way of Excellence and Prerogative, the one God, and in the words forequoted, *God in the higheſt ſence*, which is a Notion *Crellius* was extreamly angry and provoked at †, but others of known Orthodoxy pleaſed with, as an Anſwer to him and to Tritheiſm. This tho' not ſaid thus expreſly in my Sermon, yet was all could be aimed at and deſigned, and the

The Learned Mr. *Hill* calls the Father *Original God*, p. 163. *Vindication of Primitive Fathers*; & p. 113. takes the term *Mind* (relating to the Trinity) equivocally in different ſenſes.

The Father alone is Originally that Deity which Chriſt originally is not, for Chriſt is God by being of God, *Hooker's Eccleſ. Pol.* l. 5. §. 54. So Dr. *More* in the ſame place forequoted.

* *Vide* Bull *de Subordinatione Filij ad Patrem* Defenſ. Fid. Nicæn. Sect. 9.

†*Inſtabunt*, &c.

et Spiritui ſancto opponunt, ſed qui ita reſpondent, vel ſibi contradicunt, vel nihil dicunt, nudaq; nobis verba pro rebus obtrudunt. Crell. de Uno Deo, L. 1. C. 1.

Dei vero Nomen aut omnibus, aut pleriſq; omnibus primam omnium rerum cauſam ſignificat, aut quod à nullo ſit, et à quo ſint omnia, id quidem convenit λόγῳ, ſi vel cauſæ nomen proprie ſumatur, vel cum creaturis conferatur, cum enim creatus non fuerit, per eum omnia quæcunq; ſunt facta, ſed ſi collatio inſtituatur Patris cum λόγῳ, ſeu Filio, quia a nullo eſt Pater, a Patre eſt Filius, propterea Pater peculiari quadam ratione Dei nomen ſibi vendicat, nam ſi Dei nomen ens deſignat quod a nullo eſt, a quo cætera, id Patri convenit non modo ratione Naturæ Divinæ, quæ nullius cauſæ proprie dictæ ſit effectum cum omnium creaturarum ſit cauſa, quo ſenſu etiam ὁ λόγος & τὸ πνεῦμα Dei Nomen participant, ſed etiam ratione Perſonæ quæ ab alia nulla ducit orginem ullo modo cum ab ea, æterna quadam, et incomprehenſibili ratione procedant λόγος et Spiritus ſanctus. Placæi refutat. Crell. p. 252. *Vide* Crell. lb.

Deus ſummus vel Eſſentiæ, et Naturæ, vel

(*ſi*

(si ita loqui fas est) muneris ratione, priore modo Deus summus est quicunq; præditus est essentia divina, posteriore is tantum qui cum sit præditus essentia divina personam, et partes supremi atq; independentis totius Mundi Monarchiæ sustinet in Negotio salutis nostræ, i. e. *Pater.* Ib. p. 326.

Ut igitur formaliter Respondeam, Deo altissimo nihil dignius, nihil excellentius ulla ratione cogitari potest, hoc verissime dicitur de Deo altissimo comparato cum omnibus alijs entibus; at si Deus altissimus, hoc est una persona comparetur, cum Deo altissimo, h. e. *aliâ Personâ divinâ quæ cum ipsa sunt Deus altissimus distinctione opus est, est enim excellentia essentialis et excellentia personalis.* Ib. p. 28.

Ex veterum sententia cui ratio communis suffragatur, si duo in divinis essent Ingenita, sive principia a se pendentia, consequens foret ut non modo Pater suâ privaretur ἐξοχῇ qua Divinitatem à seipso hoc est, à nullo alio habet, verum etiam ut duo Dij necessario statuerentur, contra positâ subordinatione, qua Pater solus a seipso Deus, Filius vero de Deo Patre, Deus esse docetur, putarunt Doctores tum illam Patris

tris ἐξοχὴν, *tum* Divinam *Monarchiam in tuto iri collocatam; quod idem et ad tertiam* Divinitatis *perſonam, Spiritum nempe ſanctum extendi voluerunt, quem quod a Patre per Filium ipſe ſuam habeat originem,* τριθεότητα, *ſive tres* Deos *neutiquam inducere crediderunt,* Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4.

Vocabulum Deus duobus modis in ſacris ſcripturis repræſentari deprehenditur, ut abſolutè primum inoriginatum, et à nullo alio eſſe habens, à ſeipſo ita ſubſiſtens, ut prorſus originem eſſendi aliundé non agnoſcat, omnia à ſe et ex ſe habeat; inoriginatum, et origo ac principium abſolutè omnium eorum ſit, quæ in Cœlo et in Terrâ ſunt, etiam ipſius Filij et Spiritus Pater eſt, qui emphaticè, paſſim conſtanter et in Novo Teſtamento ita vocatur, Joan. 17. 1 Cor. 8. Epheſ. 1. 3, 4. Apoc. 1. 6. *et in omnibus fermè Novi Teſtamenti libris; ne ſemel autem toto novo Teſtamento* τὸ Deus, *expreſſo textu ad Patrem, Filium et Spiritum ſanctum ſimul determinatur cum unus Deus appellatur, ut iſta tria unum illum Deum eſſe dicatur, ſed ad priorem ſenſum in voce Dei â Spiritu ſancto intendi palam ſit, in veteri Teſtamento unus eſt altiſſimus Creator omnium*

ait

ait Siracides cap. 1. *& alibi.* 2. *Ut proxime ex et ab illo primo originatum, derivatum, deductum, ortum illi debens, etiam ſummum ens, ſed ortum et derivatum, proxima veluti ſummi illius ſubſiſtentis propago, et emanatio ut veteres dixerunt, genitura et ſpiratura ejus, in eſſe, nomine, auctoritate, opere, attributis et cultu Patri par, hoc modo Dei vocem ſumendo Deus etiam Filius et Spiritus* Dei *eſt.* Henricus Nicolai Profeſſor Lutheranus in Methodo Trinitatis. *Theſi.* 47.

Jehovah deducitur ab Hava vel Hajah, quod ſignificat eſſe, cum Deus ſit Eſſentia omnium Eſſentiarum — Nec incommodè ſtatuitur hanc vocem ex c. 3. Exod. v. 14. *ubi Deus dicit Ehejeh Aſcher Ehejeh — ſolus Deus eſſe ſuum habet à ſeipſo vel rectiùs eſt ſuum eſſe, reliqua entia dependent, ab hoc ſummo ente, ſolus Deus eſt* αὐτόεσιος, αὐτοφυὴς, ἄυταυτος, Gerhard *de Naturâ Dei, loci communes.*

utmoſt poſſible meaning of the word *Equivocal*, as uſed by me, which was but once tranſiently mention'd, and applyed to the Terms God, One and Three, *Deus unus et trinus*, to take off the contradiction of them. * *Petavius* expreſly allows the ambiguity or equivocal meaning of the word God, or chief and higheſt God in the very ſenſe before-mention'd; and I know none, but *Sabellians* and *Socinians*, can have reaſon to diſlike it, becauſe off that terrible Objection of theirs againſt the Trinity, that God, and Divine Being, or Perſon, are convertible and equipollent, and therefore if there be three Divine Perſons and Beings, there muſt be three Gods, whereas in one, *i. e.* the higheſt ſenſe, (of Αυτοθεὸς, Αυτόσιος, Αυτοφυὴς, Αυτός,) the word God is only convertible with, and equipollent to God the Father, and in the ſenſe which is given of it by ſeve-

* *Ambiguitas tollenda nominis hujus ſummus Deus. Etenim ſi is intelligatur ſummus, qui a nullo ducit originem, cum ab eo ducant Perſonæ cæteræ hoc ſenſu ſolum Patrem ſummum eſſe Deum non negamus, hoc eſt primum principium, & ſupremum ad quod revocantur omnia, —— ſin ille ſummus appellatur Deus cujus natura & οὐσία eſt ſumma Deitas, ſive ab nullo altero, ſive ab altero communicata, hac ratione non minus Filius, ac Spiritus Sanctus ſummus eſt Deus, quam Pater tametſi diverſo modo Deitatem obtineant.* Petav. Dogm. Theolog. de Trin L. 3. C. 1.

ſeveral †, belongs only to him; and *Melanchthon* therefore wiſely and deſignedly changes the definition of God for the like reaſon *.

† *Mahometes Azoar* 11. *Alcorani, dic ille Deum unum eſſe, qui nec genuit, nec generatus eſt.---Deum eſſe ens neceſſario exiſtens, cujus eſſe impoſſibile eſt ut ſit ab alio,* Avicenna.

Nos voce Dei intelligere ens illud quod cæteris omnibus exiſtentiam dedit, ipſum ſuam a nullo accepit. Cler. Pneumatolog. *c.* 2.

I hope upon the reading of this, both my offended Brethren (tho' I think I am the offended Brother, I am ſure I am the Injured one, and if the Scandal be ſo general according to your Letter, the Injury is the greater) will be ſenſible of their great Miſtake, and of their ungrounded Charge and Accuſation againſt me, and will recollect from whence it aroſe, from miſunderſtanding and miſapplying the word *Equivocal*, and will therefore think themſelves bound both in Honour and Conſcience to make a proper Reparation and Satisfaction, to own their Miſtake, and beg my Pardon. I hope alſo your Lordſhip, and the reſt of my Brethren, will think this reaſonable, and perſwade them to it, elſe I muſt appeal to the World, and publiſh this my Vindication as well as my Sermon; and if the doing this occaſion any further Quarrel and Diſturbance,

* *Ut autem deſcriptionem aliquam Dei teneamus, conferam duas, alteram mutilam Platonis, alteram integram quæ in Eccleſiâ tradita eſt, & ex baptiſmi verbis dicitur. Platonica hæc eſt, Deus eſt mens æterna, — ſit igitur hæc altera deſcriptio, Deus eſt Eſſentia ſpiritualis, intelligens, æterna,* Melanchthon.

ance, they who are the true cauſe of it muſt anſwer for it both to God and Man, and otherwiſe I ſhall think it a deſign to blow up a Contention very unſeaſonably at this time, and to breed a Quarrel among our ſelves, and then I can gueſs at the Secret which lyes at the bottom, and in Cyphers 'tis only *HC.* and *JB.*

I uſed all poſſible Caution in my Sermon to prevent all this, and oppoſed no body but the Deiſts and Socinians; and 'tis hard when we are defending the common Cauſe and Faith of Chriſtianity, againſt thoſe that our Brethren and Confederates ſhould out of Pique and Prejudice ſtrike in with the publick Enemy, and help to do their work for them.

I uſed no other Terms throughout all my Sermon in ſpeaking of the Divine Perſons and Bleſſed Trinity, but thoſe uſed commonly by the Church, according to the King's Directions; and I am ſure my Doctrine is entirely agreeable to that of the Primitive Church, and

ſatisfied in it, as in Chriſtianity; for 'tis Chriſtianity as diſtinct from Natural Religion, and I could dye, and ſuffer Martyrdom for it: If all the Pains I have taken to underſtand and defend it, meet with no other Reward here but Scandal and Calumny, Noiſe, Clamour and Trouble, I doubt not but the great God, and my Bleſſed Saviour, and their Holy Spirit, whoſe Glory and Honour I have ſincerely aimed at, whoſe Faith and Religion I have endeavoured to defend, will ſupport me comfortably at preſent, and recompenſe me ſufficiently hereafter.

3. As to the other thing charged or hinted, about Specifical and Numerical Eſſence, two of my Brethren who ſaw the Paper could not well remember any thing about it, nor can I gueſs, and imagine; for the words were but juſt named, with an — *hence the diſtinction of a Specifical and Numerical Eſſence* — I aſſerted not either, nor do underſtand any great difference between 'em, nor think particular Eſſence to be any thing

Ὃν ἔχει λόγον τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον, τοῦτον ἔχει ἡ οὐσία πρὸς ὑπόστασιν, Basil. Epist. 369.

Τοῦτο οὖν ἐστιν ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐκ ἡ ἀόριστος οὐσίας ἔννοια, Id. Epist. 43

Πᾶσα γὰρ οὐσία κοινὴ ἐστι τῶν ὑπαυτῆς περιεχομένων ὑποστάσεων καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εὑρεῖν μερικὴν καὶ ἐδιάξουσαν φυσὶν ἤτοι οὐσίαν. — ἡ αὐτὴ τοίνυν φύσις ἐν ἑκάστῃ τῶν ὑποστάσεων θεωρεῖται, Damasc. l. 3. c. 6.

Essentiæ in Universalibus quidem esse possunt, in solis vero individuis & particularibus substant. Boeth. *de duobus naturis & unâ Personâ Christi.*

Usiam commune aliquid esse dicunt Antiqui, Hypostasin particulare quiddam & individuum. Petav. *Dogm. Theol. de Trin.* l. 4. c. 7.

Essentia quæ definitur id per quod res est id quod est, est idæa abstracta quæ solâ ratione distinguitur ab ente, neque enim ens est in essentia neq; Essentia in ente, tanquam subjecto neque possunt separari. Cler. Ontolog. c. 4.

Aut falsum aut saltem temerarium est quicquid affirmatur de Essentijs apud Scholasticos, nisi de Idealibus essentijs quas tantum in animo habent, & quos ipsi efformarunt, confunduntque cum realibus intelligatur. Cler. Log. P. 1. p. 34.

Potius Essentia in Personis tribus subsistere dicenda est quam Tres Personæ in Unâ Essentiâ. Chamier. *de Trin.*

diſtinct from particular Beings (*a*); but I was not then to teach my Auditors Metaphyſicks, nor am now my Brethren, but I remember I expreſly affirm'd in my Sermon, that there was no Multiplication of Eſſence in the ſeveral Divine Perſons, which I hope was very Orthodox, and ſo was every thing I ſaid.

After all this long Scribble, which has tired me, and which I had not time to ſhorten, and for which I begg your Lordſhips Patience and Pardon, I have but one thing more to anſwer, Why I did not carry my Notes to my two offended Brethren, as was deſired by the Letter? To which I Reply, That I had done that before, and read thoſe Paſſages they excepted againſt to both of them, according to my Promiſe in Chapter: And I hope your Lordſhip, upon ſecond Thoughts, will not think fit, that one of equal Character to them in other things, and not the leſs I hope as the King's Chaplain, ſhould be ſo contemptibly treated, as

to be Obliged to go backwards and forwards with his Sermon, and to wait upon his Accuſers at their Houſes with his Notes, as often as they ſhall pleaſe to call for them, only to pick out perhaps if they can, ſome New Cavils againſt them : But in truth I could not do this, had I been never ſo humble and willing, for my Notes are looſe and mangled at the Preſs, and from thence they and the World may I hope expect a Copy of them very ſhortly.

My Lord,

I ſend you the ſame Letter in print, only a little enlarged, which I ſent you ſome few Months ago in Writing, being of the ſame Opinion with your Lordſhip, that ſince this has made ſo much Talk and Noiſe, that ſomething ought to be made publick concerning it ; and I doubt not but this will give full Satisfaction to all Learned and Unprejudiced perſons, who have any true Knowledge and Underſtanding in that Controverſie, who will ſee by the

Authorities

Authorities and Quotations I have uſed, not only a ſufficient Defence of my Doctrine, and a full Agreement in it of the beſt Divines, but ſuch a ſtate of that Controverſy againſt all the Adverſaries of the Bleſſed Trinity as may give an Anſwer to their Objections againſt it, and help others rightly to underſtand it. I have choſen to ſpeak out the Truth from the Mouths of others of unqueſtioned Credit, rather than my own, that I might not be thought to be ſingular, and becauſe 'tis very difficult and dangerous ſometimes, as one long agoe obſerved *. To ſpeak truth of ſuch high matters, No Man does more fully believe the true Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt than my ſelf, as is well known to all that know me, and appears by ſeveral Sermons preached at *W*—— and other places, and for one of them not long agoe Tritheiſm was laid to my charge, (as that and Polytheiſm was of old to all the Orthodox Believers of a Trinity (*a*) in a rude and inſolent Preface, which reflected

* *Vera de Deo, dicere admodum periculum ſit.* Ruffin in Symbol.

(*a*) So the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as appears by *Athanaſius*, &c.

Athanas. contra Arrian Orat. 4. Id. contra Sabel Gregales. *Vide* Genebrardi Respons. ad Joseph. Albo & David Kimchi.

ἐξ ὧν καὶ τοὺς προδότας Ἰουδαίους δυσωπεῖν δυνάμεθα καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων διαλύειν κατηγορίαν, φασκόντων καὶ νομιζόντων διὰ τὴν Τριάδα λέγειν καὶ ἡμᾶς πολλοὺς θεούς.

Ἰουδαίοι τὸν ὑὸν τοῦ θεοῦ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα γέγονε ἀρνούμενοι καὶ τοῖς δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα σεβομένοις ἐγκαλοῦντες πολυθεότητα.

Thus *Lucian* in his Dialogue, *Philopatris*: And *Celsus apud Originem contra Cels.* l. 8.

So did the *Sabellians*, who laid the like Charge against *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, when he had condemned *Sabellius*, from which Charge he was acquitted in a Synod at *Rome*, Anno 263.

Tertullian adv. Prax.

Itaque duos & tres jam jactitant à nobis prædicari se vero Unius Dei cultores præsumunt.

Vide Euseb. *contra* Marcellum *& Theolog. Eccles.*

Concilia Labbe. *T.* 1. *p.* 875.

So *Paulus Samosatenus*, as appears by his Questions to *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, εἰ δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία δύο θεοὺς οὐ λέγει, οὐδὲ παρέλαβεν ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς οἶδας ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, &c. — *Dionysius* his Answer, Λαλεῖς βλασφημῶν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀδικίαν ἐπιφημίζων ὅτι ὁ λέγων θεὸν τὸν λόγον τοῦ πατρὸς ἰησοῦν μονογενῆ δύο θεοὺς λέγει. And the Synodic Epistle of the Council of *Antioch* to him, Ὁ φάσκων δύο θεοὺς καταγγελλέσθι, ἐὰν ὁ ὑὸς θεοῦ θεὸς κηρύσσεται τοῦτον ἀλλοτρίον τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ κανονος ἡγούμεθα.

Ibid.

Facund. Hermianens. *l.* 4.

So *Photinus*, as appears by *Julian*'s Letter to him.

Athanas. contra Arrian. Orat. 5.

So the *Arrians*, as appears in many places of *Athanasius* and others against them, Εἰ ὁ πατέρα καὶ τὸν ὑὸν γινώσκων δύο θεοὺς λέγει

ἄρα

ἄρα καὶ τὸν λέγοντα ἕνα ἀναιρεῖν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ Σαβελλίζειν, εἰ γὰρ ὁ λέγων δύο Ἑλληνίζει, ὡσὰν ὁ λέγων ἕνα Σαβελλίζει.

So they and the *Macedonians*, as appears by St. *Basil's* particular Discourse, πρὸς τοὺς συκοφαντοῦντας ἡμᾶς ὅτι τρεῖς θεοὺς λέγομεν, and *Gregory Nyssens* Epistle *ad Ablabium*, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ τρεῖς θεοί, and *Gregory Nazianzens* often answering the Charge of *Tritheism*, and saying, μήτε τὸ τῆς τριθεΐας ἔγκλημα ἀνομβῆς.

Basil ὁμιλία 29.
Greg. Nyssen. Epist. ad Ablab.
Greg. Naz. Orat. 23.

So the Mahomitans, *out of whose Alcoran these words are alledged by the* Centuriat. Magdeburg. *Omnes quidem dicentes Christum Jesum, Mariæ Filium Deum existere, mendaces reperti sunt, cum Christus ipse dixerit, in Dominum Deum meum atque vestrum credité.* — *Sunt iterum increduli affirmantes Deos tres esse, quia non est nisi Deus Unus.* And *Cantacuzenus* in his Oration against *Mahomet*, says, *Nec Christum Deum adorare confessus est, ne duos Deos adorare deprehenderetur.*

Centur. Magdeburg. 7. ex Alcorani Azoara 12.
Cantacuzen. Orat. 3. apud Gualter. Alcor Interpret.

The *Socinians* 'tis notorious lay this charge of Tritheism against the blessed Trinity in all their Writings.

flected not only upon me and others, but upon all the Biſhops of *England*, and was thought by them to deſerve Cenſure: This was only for aſſerting with the Ancients and beſt Moderns, the Diſtinct Being and ὑπόστασις of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt (*b*), and that they were Proper and Real Perſons, and not only Modes, Reſpects, Characters, Offices, Names, *&c.* of one Divine Being or Perſon. Now a very different and even contrary Charges comes upon me, from the ſame quarter, and is raiſed by the ſame Spirit, which like the Teſtimony of Falſe Witneſſes betrays and diſcovers its own Untruth by its own Contradictions. I proteſt by all that's Sacred, I never ſaid the Words charged upon me, and they are only a falſe Inference of their own, from their miſtaking and miſunderſtanding of my Words, and not rightly underſtanding the Controverſie, as I hope will fully appear to all Learned and Impartial Readers of this Letter, and eſpecially to your Lordſhip, to whoſe Candor and Judgment I commit it, hoping you will pardon ſome things writ in great haſt, and ſome little heat upon ſuch a Provocation. If my Accuſers be not ſatisfied by it, I challenge them with all their mighty Zeal and Knowledge both, fairly to reply to it, and to the Authorities here produced. I am your Lordſhips

Moſt Humble and Obedient Servant,

W. Payne.

Advertiſement.

THe Errata's of the Preſs are too many to be particularized, eſpecially in the Greek, the Learned and Candid Reader will eaſily ſee and Correct them.

(b) Τελείαι ὑποστάσεις Τέλεια πρόσωπα.

Ἑκαστὸν ἐπὶ τῆς πριάδος ἓν ὂν ἐπιγινώσκεται.

Θρησκεύομεν οὖν τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα.

Εἰ γοῦν ἕν τι μόνον εἶναι πρᾶγμα νομίζεις δύο δὲ ὄντα κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἀγνοεῖς τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν.

Ἕν τὸ ὑποκείνμεον λεγόντων τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, προσηγορίας δὲ διαφερούσας τῶ ἕνι πράγματι ἐπιφημίζεσθαι πονηρὰ ἡ ἀσέβεια καὶ φευκτὴ — χρῆται δὲ καὶ νομικῇ φωνῇ (Joan. 3. δύο μαρτυροῦντες) καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δύο παρίστησιν ὄντας αὐτόντε καὶ τὸν πατέρα. —

Οὐ γὰρ ἐξαρκεῖ διαφορὰς προσώπων ἀποριθμήσασθαι ἀλλὰ χρῇ ἑκαστὸν προσώπων ἐν ὑποστάσει ἀληθινῇ ὑπάρχειν ὁμολογεῖν, ἐπεὶ τὸν γε ἀναπόστατον τῶν προσώπων ἀναπλασμὸν οὐδὲ ὁ Σαβελλιὸς παρητήσατο, εἰπὼν τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἕνα τῶν ὑποκειμένων ὄντα πρὸς τὰς ἑκάστοτε παραπιπτούσας χρείας μεταμορφούμενον, νῦν μὲν ὡς πατέρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς υἱὸν, νῦν δὲ ὡς ἅγιον πνεῦμα διαλέγεσθαι. — Ἕνι πράγματι τὰς πάσας προσηγορίας προστιθεὶς.

Αλλὰ λέγε πατέρα λέγε καὶ υἱὸν μὴ ἕνι πράγματι δύο ὀνόματα ἐπιφθεγγόμενος, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑκατέρας προσηγορίας ἰδίαν ἔννοιαν διδασκόμενος.

Διότι τῶν πραγμάτων ἐστὶ σήμαντικὰ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ δὲ πράγματα ἰδιάζουσαν καὶ αὐτοτελῆ ὕπαρξιν ἔχειν οὐδεὶς τῶν καὶ μικρὸν κατεχόντων τοῦ φρονεῖν ἀμφιβάλλει.

Ἀχώριστα πράγματα δύο τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν.

Synod Epist. Concil. Constantinop. ad Damasum. Basil Epist. ad Cæsar. Origen contra Cels. C. 8. Athanas. contra Sabell. Basil in Princip. Evan. Joan. Athanas. contra Sabel. Gregal. Basil Epist. ad Cæsariens.

Id. contra Sabel & Arr.

Id. Epist. ad Cæsar.

Alexandr. Epist. ad Alexandr. Theodoret. E. H. l. 1.

How different is this from what we find afterwards in the *Lateran Council*, which in direct opposition to the best Antiquity, determined as we have it in *Greek*, ὅτι ἕν τι ἀκρότατον πρᾶγμα ἐστὶν ἀκατάληπτον τε καὶ ἄφατον ὅπερ ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ οὐτω τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα ὁ πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὅτι ἕκαστον τῶν τριῶν προσώπων ἐκεῖνο τὸ πρᾶγμα. When in those Ignorant and barbarous Ages the true Notion was altered by *Roman* Power and Scholastic Subtlety, which was preserved but a little before in *Damascene*, *Scotus Erigena*, and in a Synod that then decreed the Three Persons to be *Tres res distinctas*. Oto Frisingen. *L.* 1. *C.* 47.

Concil. Lateran. General. 4tum Capitul. 2. Concil. Labbè.

Scriptura certè nominat Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, ut Res inter se distinctas, Individus

Zanchius de tribus Elohim. C. 2.

viduas, Subsistentes, Intelligentes Volentes. Ne quod triplici Nomine dicitur rem unam esse putemus. Ibid. *de Decret Alexand.*

— Hos tres esse tres res —— Personæ seu res per se subsistentes. Id.

Unaquæque persona est aliqua res simpliciter & absoluta — sunt tres res — quia per hanc Numerationem solum indicatur absoluta & realis distinctio inter illas. Suarez *de Trin.* L. 3. C. 6.

Nihilominus simpliciter verum censeo tres Personas esse tria Entia Realia. Ib.

—

The Criticks, such as *Valla*, had no Cause to find fault with *Boethius*, for applying the Notion of Person to an Intelligent Being subsisting by it self, therefore I cannot but wonder at the Niceness of some late Men. — Themselves confess *Boethius* his Definition of a Person (*Substantia Rationalis individua*,&c.) to be true enough,but they say it belongs to the Creatures, and not to God, for it would make three Gods. —— And he plainly allows three Persons to be three Individual Beings. *Bishop* Stillingfleet's *Dialogue concerning Trinity and Transubstant.*

This great Man, when his Adversary had told him, that his defending the Doctrine of the Trinity by reason, showed he was a bold Man, and would venture further than Wiser Men; thus Answers, *(And I make bold to vindicate my self with his Words)* It may be others have not the Leisure or Curiosity to examine a Mystery believed to be so much out of the reach of our Understanding, and have confounded themselves and others so much with School-Terms, as to leave the matter rather more obscure than it was before, but I shall endeavour to make things as clear as they will bear.

Advertisement.

THese Papers were Written; and Printed most part of them, before the Bishop of *Worcesters* late Book.

Poſtſcript.

My Lord,

SInce the Printing this Letter in Vindication of my Sermon, your Lordſhip and my Brethren in a full and late Chapter, have upon a freſh Debate and further Examination of the matter, been pleaſed to own your ſelves ſatisfied about it; ſo that were it not as Neceſſary, both upon Publick and Private Reaſons, to ſatisfie the World too, I could almoſt have wiſht this Letter had not been printed at all, it being writ haſtily in a few dayes, and being the firſt and free running of my Thoughts, without any Laboured or Artificial Compoſure; to which I added very little, but only ſome Authorities to be my Vouchers and Compurgators for ſome Words that were not underſtood, and therefore odd and offenſive to ſome, but very neceſſa-

ry and very uſual with the beſt Writers againſt Socinianiſm, when they are anſwering their ſubtileſt Objections, and like Fencers, keeping their Eye upon their Adverſaries, and avoiding all their Thruſts. However, I could now have wiſht that ſome few things, ſavouring a little Reſentment, which was excuſable at that time I hope both to me and others, when we did not ſo well underſtand one another, had been left out: For I am now better ſatisfied, that there was nothing of that perſonal Prejudice and ill Will, or unkind Deſign from any, upon ſome other accounts, which I ſuſpected to have been in it; but that it all aroſe from pure miſtake, and miſunderſtanding ſome ſome few Words and Expreſſions in my Sermon, which were thought to have another meaning than they really had; and this may eaſily happen upon a tranſient hearing or reading a Diſcourſe, upon ſo Nice a Subject as the Trinity, which I could not avoid on that day, and which I made as plain and uſeful as I could, and only cryptically and in

a few words took off one great and obvious Difficulty and Objection, that of Three Gods, and One God, which is always thrown in the way, and is the mighty Stumbling-block in that Article of our Christian Faith, which others have been heaving at with a great many Scolastick Levers, and I thought one word would remove it, and take off all the objected Contradiction. The misunderstanding the word *Equivocal*, used upon that Occasion, was the chief, if not the only reason of my Worthy Brothers concerning himself in the matter. He who was the first Occasion of all this, has abundantly convinced me, that it was no other misunderstanding between us, both by his Protestations and Civil Treatment, and genteel begging my Pardon for it; and I do now begg his, and any other of my Brethrens, for any thing that may seem in this Letter to be any ways reflecting upon them, and especially of Dr. S—, who hath given too many Instances of his Learning to be denyed,

and

and a greater than I expected in this matter of his Temper. I have no need, I am ſure, to do this to your Lordſhip, for whom I have too much Reſpect and Veneration to let any thing drop from my Pen or Tongue, ſo unagreeable to my Mind and Thoughts: Every one ſees ſo much of the Gentleman as well as the Scholar, ſhining through your Sacred Character, and ſo much Good Breeding and Civility joined with your Paternal Wiſdom and Gravity, that your Excellent Temper will no more let you do an il-natured and unbecoming thing, than your Admirable Pen, which has been a great while the Standard of *Engliſh* Eloquence, will let you write an unfit one. Your Zeal for the Catholick Faith, and your particular Duty made it fit and Neceſſary for you to take Notice of ſuch a Charge as was brought you againſt my Sermon: I muſt have blamed your Lordſhip, and my Brethren as much as others, if you had not done it; and be ſo far from taking it ill, that I muſt thank you for it, for the right

you

you have herehy done to the Faith and to me both: Like a true Friend of the King and Government, if taken up by miſtake, thro' the haſty Zeal of an officious Conſtable or Informer, when he has ſhown the miſtake, and clear'd himſelf to the Magiſtrates upon the ſtricteſt enquiry, he will rather commend and thank 'em for their Zeal and Care of the Publick, than be any ways angry with them for the little trouble and inconvenience that was accidentally given to himſelf in ſerving ſo good an end, which he ſo much likes and prefers to any thing private. I would willingly ſacrifice my own particular Credit, and all the worldly Intereſts I have, to the Cauſe of Chriſtianity in general, or to that Fundamental part of it, the Doctrine of the Trinity; without which Chriſtianity will, in my Opinion, loſe its peculiar Scheme and Conſtitution, and its great and auguſt Character; and therefore I have endeavoured, the beſt way I can, to defend this againſt its Adverſaries, and to repreſent

it to its Friends in the beſt light, that of the Scriptures and Antiquity, in which it appears much clearer than in thoſe Scholaſtick Diſputes and Explications which have only clouded and obſcured it, and turn'd plain Chriſtianity into a Metaphyſical Subtlety. But when thoſe who defend and maintain the Faith, are brought under a Charge of undermining and betraying it, this is not only a particular Injury to themſelves, which it is very hard to lye under; and no Man, as one ſays, ought to be patient under the Suſpicion of Hereſie; but it is a great injury and diſſervice to the Faith it ſelf, by ſuppoſing its pretended and avowed Friends to be its ſecret Enemies; and that upon a free enquiry and examining into it, they ſee reaſon to be ſo; and thereby rendring the very Doctrine ſuſpicious and queſtionable, as well as increaſing the Number, and adding to the Party and Intereſt of its profeſt Adverſaries. The charging any ſuch Suſpicion of Hereſie upon me, and ſome others, and eſpecially of *Socinianiſm*, will look

as

as ridiculous and incredible to thoſe who know us, as Sir *John Fenwick*'s charging ſome of the known Friends and Aſſertors of the Government with being in the Plot, and inclined to Jacobitiſm: I have given ſo much Evidence to the contrary in all my Diſcouriſes and Sermons, that if any think they might have reaſon to do this for a few miſtaken Words and Expreſſions, which they do not like or underſtand, others may upon the ſame account charge me with Popery too; tho' I have writ ſo many Treatiſes againſt it, becauſe I followed not exactactly their Words and Phraſes, or their Method of Writing and Thinking, in managing thoſe Subjects, but either granted too much to my Adverſaries, or aſſerted ſomething that they think odd and ſuſpicious, and looks to them like a Popiſh Principle. As when in a Diſcourſe on the Sacrifice of the Maſs, I own the Euchariſt to be a Sacrifice in ſome ſenſe, and in ſome ſenſe Propitiatory too, from hence there may be as good ground to charge Popery upon me, as any thing

Heretical or Socinian, upon the miſtaken and miſunderſtood Words of my Sermon, when the whole Scope, Deſign and Drift of it, was to the contrary.

Perverſe and Angry Men, tyed up to their own Models and narrow Syſtems, might have made as great a Work, and ſtirred up as great Suſpitions, Conteſts and Diſſentions among our ſelves, a few Years ago, about ſeveral Points relating to thoſe Popiſh Controverſies, as about the Real Preſence, Juſtification, Good Works, and the like, as have been more lately, and very unhappily raiſed about the Trinity, and have given as great an advantage to the common Enemy by ſo doing: And no doubt the one would have took hold of it, and improved it as much againſt the common Cauſe then, as the others have done ſince. But tho' I think it would have been very imprudent, and very dangerous, both then and now, to ſtop the Controverſie, and impoſe ſilence upon this account, and let our Adverſaries write on and triumph without Anſwers, and ſo to loſe the Truth

Truth for fear of loſing Peace, yet common Prudence and Chriſtian Charity, and a hearty concern for the common Cauſe, ſhould make all Writers agree in one Caſe as well as the other, notwithſtanding ſome little difference of Thoughts and Expreſſions, and not break out into a Civil War among our ſelves, while we are oppoſing a publick Enemy, when in the main we do agree in the ſame Doctrine, the ſame Article and Confeſſion, as 'tis expreſt by our Church.

The School-men and Divines of the Church of *Rome* differ very much among themſelves about theſe very matters. *Peter Lombard* and *Richardus de Sancto Victore* about the Definition of a Perſon, and Eſſence generating Eſſence; *Durandus*, *Scotus*, *Ocham* and *Biel* about the Divine Unity, and whether the diſtinction in the Deity be real and Formal, or Modal and Virtual. The *Scotiſts* and *Thomiſts* have their known Differences and Parties about thoſe and other things; *Copreolus* and *Aureolus* differ throughout; ſo do the Jeſuites and Dominicans, *Molina*

with *Thomas*, and *Cajetan*, *Valentia*, *Suarez* and *Vaſquez*, tho' all Jeſuites, yet diſpute fiercely with one another; the two latter eſpecially, about the famous Queſtion of a common Subſiſtence in the Trinity, whilſt *Arriba* is very zealous againſt them all, for allowing *Aliquid Relativum* as well as *Abſolutum* in the Trinity. And to name no others, *Tanner*, *Ruiz* and *Arriaga* oppoſe one another, and thoſe that have gone before them, in ſeveral high Points, as do indeed all their Modern Writers, taking the part ſometimes of *Scotus*, and ſometimes of *Thomas*, and ſometimes differing from both, and always from thoſe that wrote a little before them: They diſpute Problematically, and hold different Opinions concerning theſe Trinitarian Points, as much as other Theological Queſtions; and particularly *Ruiz* * propoſes an Explication of the Trinity, different from the common Soholaſtic one; making the Three Perſons together God adequately, and each ſingle Perſon God inadequately: Which tho' he aſſerts not, yet by his Authorities out of the Fathers

* *Diſp.* 22. *Sect.* 1.

we

we may ſee he Favours, whilſt all of them ſtill agree in the common Faith of the Article, as 'tis determined and expreſt in the words of their Church. So long as they do this, none of their Infallible Popes, or wiſe Biſhops, have thought fit to interpoſe by their Authority, or to determine on one ſide or other, or to impoſe ſilence upon all, notwithſtanding the mighy plenitude of their Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and the wretched Slavery which hath been complained of under it, even the worſt of Slaveries to rational Creatures, that of their Minds and Thoughts; Notwithſtanding that, it ſeems, their own Members, and their Learned Men have a free Liberty of venting their private Thoughts and different Sentiments, even in thoſe high matters, ſo long as they conſent and ſubſcribe to the general Doctrine of their Church. Nay, which is more ſtrange, and more to be wondered at, they have never cenſured, that I know of, thoſe known and exceptionable Paſſages and bold Aſſertions in *Durandus*, *Aliaco*, *Eraſmus*,

mus, *Genebrard*, and others, of Three Gods in a Perſonal ſenſe, and of *Cajetan*, *Molina*, *Javellus*, and abundance of their celebrated Writers, holding Three Eternals and Omnipotents, and Interpreting the *Athanaſian Creed* ſo as to make thoſe Adjectives ſignifie only Subſtantively and Eſſentially. While they allow this Freedom, Liberty and Latitude to their Friends and to one another, they give no quarter to their Adverſaries out of their Communion, but purſue them, and particularly Mr. *Calvin*, with the heavieſt Charges of Blaſphemy and Tritheiſm, Nay, even of Atheiſm, for the leaſt unwary and exceptionable Expreſſions about the Trinity, as may be ſeen in *Genebrard de Trin. Fevardentius*'s *Theomachia*, *Salmero*'s *Diſput. Poſſevin in Atheiſmis*, and others. The Reaſon is plain, they hated them upon other Accounts, and were reſolved to quarrel with them upon all Occaſions they could find: They bore an hoſtile Mind and inveterate Spirit, and implacable Malice againſt them for other Reaſons, and therefore lay at Catch, to

Accuſe

Accuſe and Expoſe them, tho' never ſo falſly and unjuſtly, and reſolved to perſue the Charge of Hereſie againſt them in all Points where there was the leaſt ſhadow or colour, and eſpecially in ſo tender a point as this of the Trinity, where 'tis ſo eaſie to make it with a little Spite and Malice, and ſo hard to avoid it with the utmoſt Caution, upon ſo Nice and Difficult a Subject. The Learned Friends of the Reformation have ſufficiently cleared and vindicated Mr. *Calvin*'s Orthodoxy in thoſe Points, notwithſtanding ſome few Expreſſions, by which he diſlikes calling the Trinity one God, *&c.* as not ſtrictly Scriptural, (*in Epiſt. ad Polon*) and it would have been looked upon as a very odious and ill Office, to the Service of Popery and Diſhonour of the Reformation, if any Proteſtant had joined with his Popiſh Enemies and Accuſers, and countenanced or maintained the ſame Charge againſt him. If there were a true Spirit of Chriſtian Charity, Love and Good Will among us, our Differences and Diſſentions

Diſſentions about the Trinity would quickly be at an end, however high they have been carried of late by ſome among us. Your Lordſhip I know will take Care, with your great Prudence and Temper, to preſerve this among us at *Weſtminſter* : And may the God of Peace and Love inſpire the Hearts of all Chriſtians, and eſpecially of all Clergy-men, who are of the ſame Faith and the ſame Communion, that they *may keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, and hold the Myſtery of the Faith in a pure Conſcience.*

Some

Some Opinions and Differences of the School-men and Romiſh Divines, about *Deus Unus & Trinus.*

DEus genuit Deum qui non eſt Deus Pater, ergo non eſt tantum unus Deus perſonaliter, quod verum eſt. Durandus in Sentent. *Lib.* 1. *Diſt.* 5. *Qu.* 2.

Senſit Petrus de Aliaco, in 1 Q. 3. *circa finem, et* Q. 5. *per totum, et ut videtur,* Marſilius *in* 1. q. 5. art. 2. *ad* 5. Sc. *de rigore Sermonis rectè poſſe dici perſonas eſſe tres Deos, et tantum vitari oportere eum modum loquendi propter periculum ne credantur tres Divinitates,* Valent. Diſp. 2. Qu. 13. Punct. 3.

Quùm Deus ponitur reſpectu termini vel prædicati eſſentialis ſupponit pro eſſentiâ, ſed quùm in reſpectu termini vel prædicati notionalis ſupponit pro perſonâ, et hoc intelligitur quùm ponitur reſpectu termini preciſè ſupponentis pro ſuppoſito vel eſſentiâ, et hoc rationabiliter tum propter identitatem divinæ naturæ et ſuppoſiti, tum etiam propter Hæreticos, ne ſi Deus preciſè ſupponeret pro ſuppoſito, multæ propoſitiones eſſent concedendæ quæ per aſtutiam Hæreticorum ſimpliciùs propo-

ſitæ, eſſent ijs occaſio errandi & credendi pluralitatem Deorum ac Divinarum Eſſentiarum. Biel Repertorium, *L.* 1. *Diſt.* 4. *Qu.* 1.

Notandum quòd cum Deus ponitur cum ſigno alietatis, aut importante pluralitatem ſupponit eſſentialiter, & hoc ne ſi concederent quod Pater eſt alius Deus à Filio, ſimplices putarent eſſe plures Deos; cavent enim Doctores ne detur occaſio errandi ſimplicibus quo credant eſſe plures Deos eſſentialiter diſtinctos, quo modo errent idololatræ, & ideo illæ negantur Deus genuit Deum, Pater Filius & Spiritus ſanctus ſunt tres Dij, quamvis concedatur quod perſona genuit aliam perſonam divinam. Ibid.

Catholicè dici poteſt una eſſentia trium perſonarum et tres perſonæ unius eſſentiæ, non autem unus Deus trium perſonarum, vel tres perſonæ unius Dei. Id. *L.* 1. *Diſt.* 34.

Hæc cum Petro Aliaco non ſatisfacerent, (Sc. *Explicatio ſymboli Athanaſ.* non tres æterni, *&c. quam* Thom. Aquin. Holcot *& alij dabant*) *aliam interpretationem indagare coactus eſt; in Symbolo, inquit, cum concedantur tres coæterni, miror quare ibidem negantur tres æterni, nec video rationem diverſitatis; poſtea dum quærit ſitne aliquo ſenſu concedendum tres eſſe Deos, quid his reſponderi velit, indicat, ait Dei nomen aliquando ſumi eſſentialiter, atq; ita reciprocari cum eſſentiæ divinæ ſeu divinitatis vocabulo, eiq; eſſe plane* συνωνυμον, *aliquando intelligi perſonaliter ſupponereq;* συνωνυμως *pro divina perſonâ et ſic Deum generari à Deo, et Chriſtum Dei eſſe Filium; priore deſigna-*

designatione non credendum esse tres Deos, ne Dei essentia multiplex existimetur, posteriore quemmodum istæ propositiones recipiuntur, non tantum est una persona divina vel tres sunt personæ divinæ quarum quælibet est Deus, sic agnoscendas esse has non tantum est unus Deus, vel plures sunt Dei, quod tales idem penitus valeant juxta hanc alteram significationem idq; apparere per nominis rationem atq; vim. Aliaco *q. 5. prim. Sentent.* Genebrard *de Trin.* l. 3. p. 234.

Posset etiam dici nomen Deus interdum spectare ad personam & eo sensu esse tres Deos, — interdum idq; sæpius ad essentiam referri, — tumq; Unicus est Deus, Id. *p.* 237.

Si mavis tres Deos in tres divinas personas possis dicere atq; interpretari, non vocabulum Deus aliquandò sumitur hypostatiè ut Deus a Deo, Id. *L. 2. p.* 155.

Ad eosdem pertinet quod adjicio de tribus Dijs, hoc ἀξίωμα, quum Petrus Aliacensis assentientibus Theologis putet in aliquo sensu verum tamen apud populum magno offendiculo dicitur, inter eruditos nihil habet offensæ, quibus cognitum est Dei vocabulum, non semper sonare divinam essentiam, sed accipi nomen pro personâ ut cum dicimus Deus gignit Deum, & Jesum esse Filium Dei, nihil enim aliud intelligunt docti, quam esse tres personas in quarum unamquamq; competat Dei vocabulum. Neq; prorsus negat Alliacensis posse dici tres omnipotentes ac tres æternos, & si negaret consequitur tamen ex his quæ concessit posse dici tres Deos, licet non simpliciter, quemadmodum enim juxta Dialecticam

non eſt abſurdum dicere tres ſapientes unâ ſapientiâ, tres bonos eadem bonitate, tres omnipotentes eâdem omnipotentiâ, tres eſſe ſed eâdem eſſentiâ, tres volentes eâdem voluntate, ita non arbitror impium dicere tres Deos eodem Deitate, non enim minùs ad ſubſtantiam Dei pertinet Deum eſſe quam ſapientem eſſe, verum ut hæc non aſſerit Alliacenſis, ita nec ego aſſero in hoc tantum adduxi ut docerem fieri poſſe ut quædam ſint vera juxta ſenſum aliquem, quæ tamen apud imperitos efferri non expediat. Eraſmus *in Hyperaſpiſt. diatribæ contra* Lutherum *de ſervo arbitrio.*

However exceptionable the Aſſertions of theſe Men are, yet the Church of *Rome* never cenſured them, and the *Socinians* cannot take any advantage againſt them, ſince *Socinus* * ſays (againſt *Wiekus*) that it is ſo far from *Pagan* to worſhip two Gods, that 'tis moſt Chriſtian, and *Smalcius* ſays 'tis Jewiſh to believe and worſhip but one God, and *Crellius* † ſays 'tis no way contrary to Scripture to have two Gods, they who are for worſhipping Chriſt, muſt all ſay this, and their Hereſie lyes in making him a God only by Office and not by Nature, they are therefore truly chargeable with *Polytheiſm* as the *Arrians* were of old, who worſhip a Creature as God, or any being that has not the true Divine Nature and Eſſence, but they who hold the ſame

Divi

* *Tantum abeſt ut qui iſta profitetur (ſc. Chriſtianis duos eſſe Deos, hoc enim objecrat Wiekus) propter id ut Wieko placet, non Chriſtianus ſed Ethnicus ſit appellandus.* Socin. *Reſponſ. ad* Wiekum. *C.* 1.

† *Quaſi aut duos Deos haberemus ſummos, aut Unum habere Deum ſummum, alterum vero ab eo dependentem eiq; ſubordinatum ſacris literis ſit adverſum?* Crel. *de uno Deo,* C. 1. S. 2. C. 18.

Divinity, the ſame one Eſſence to be in three Perſons, and communicated from the firſt to the two other, as from one ἀρχὴ and *Principium* can never be charged with Polytheiſm or Tritheiſm; all the Tritheiſts who were condemned in late and dark times, holding three Eſſences and ſo oppoſing the ὁμοούσιον, as the *Peratæ* in *Theodoret*, *Philoponus* in *Nicephorus*, and *Photius*: *Joachim* in the Lateran Council, *Roſcelin* in the Synod of *Soiſſons*, *Abælardus* in the Synod of *Soiſſons*, *Porretanus* in that of *Rhemes*, but of this elſewhere. I ſhall only inſtance further in the Opinions and Differences of the Scholaſtick and Romiſh Divines about three Eternals, Omnipotents, *&c.* and three Subſiſtencies.

Dicimus tres exiſtentes, vel tres ſapientes, aut tres æternos & increatos ſi adjectivè ſumantur, ſi vero ſubſtantivè ſumantur dicimus unum increatum, immenſum & æternum, ut Athanaſius *dicit.* Cajetan *Comment. in* Thom. *Qu.* 39. *Art.* 3. Athanaſius *ſubſtantivis uſus eſt adjectivè in Symbolo.* Javell. *Expoſit. in* Cajetan. *Ibid.*

Petavius explains this otherwiſe againſt theſe and *Thomas Aquinas* too, — *Quem ad finem verba illa in Symbolo poſita ſunt imprimis ſpectare convenit, hæc igitur adverſus Arrianorum Hæreſin oppoſita videntur á conditore ſymboli, quæ Trinitatem cum tribus componebat perſonis inæqualibus et ſubſtantia diverſis quarum ſingulæ ſingulis conſtabant ut naturis ita proprietatibus naturæ.* Petav. *de Trin.* p. 286.

Molina:

Molina had before upon the Principles of *Aquinas*, endeavoured to reconcile the *Athanasian Creed*, about one Omnipotent Eternal, with the Council of *Lateran*, which declared for three Coeternals, *&c.* thus; *Ex conclusione* D. Thomæ *regulâq; propositâ, facile erit intelligere rationem conciliandi quædam dicta in Symbolo Athanasij & in Concilio Lateranensi Cap. Firm. de summa Trin. & in fide catholicâ, quæ primo aspectu videntur contraria inter se. In Symbolo namq; Athanasij, de Patre, Filio & Spiritu sancto dicitur, non tres æterni in plurali, sed unus æternus, sicut non tres increati nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus & unus immensus & infra, non tres omnipotentes sed unus omnipotens. Cap. vero firm. de eodem Patre, Filio & Spiritu sancto dicitur in plurali, consubstantiales, et coequales, et co-omnipotentes, et coeterni, imo in eodem Symbolo Athanasij, eadem personæ etiam dicuntur coeternæ, eis verbis coeternæ sibi sunt et coequales; hæc, ex dictis, in hunc modum concilianda. Athanasius in locis primo loco citatis, sumpsit nomina illa substantive, (tametsi quædam eorum, quod non sumantur in terminatione neutrâ, pre se ferant formam Adjectivorum) ideoq; negavit dici pluraliter de tribus personis. Concilium vero Lateranense, idemq; Athanasius, ubi secundo loco citatur, sumpserunt illa alia nomina adjectivè eâq; ratione tribuerunt illa tribus personis in numero plurali.* Molina *Comment. in* Thom. *p.* 1. *q.* 39. *art.* 3. *disp.* 1.

Arriba oppoſes *Molina*, and gives another Anſwer

Answer to this Difficulty, *Respondeo ad difficultatem, quod concilium Lateranense dum affirmat Patrem, Filium & Spiritum sanctum in plurali numero esse consubstantiales, coequales & coeternos, & coomnipotentes, loquitur de ipsis secundum rationem & habitudinem relativam, quæ ratione prædictæ particulæ defert pluralitatem in suppositis Existentibus à parte subjecti.* Arriba *conciliatorium* Lib. 2. disp. 3. c. 13.

As to the Divine Subsistencies the Differences are greater, *Tres sunt de hâc re Scholasticorum Opiniones, prima unum esse subsistentiam essentialem seu absolutam, & nullas personales seu relativas, ita* Durandus, Paludanus, Capreolus, *in* 3. d. 1. *quibus videtur favere* Thomas *qu.* 2. *de potèn. a.* 1. & *qu.* 8. *a.* 3, & 7. *secunda tres esse subsistentias relativas & nullam absolutam seu essentialem ita* Bonaventura *& alij multi, tertia unam esse subsistentium absolutam & tres relativas ita* Cajetanus *in* 1 *p. q.* 3. *a.* 3. & *in* 3 *p. q.* 2. *a.* 2. Becanus *de Trin.* C. 3. Qu. 11.

Singularis quædam opinio doctissimi alioqui Theologi Cajetani, *qui in* 1 p. qu. 3. art. 3. *& qu.* 39. *art.* 4. *existimavit præter tres subsistentias relativas, quibus constituuntur personæ, esse etiam in Divinis quandam subsistentiam absolutam, quæ cum essentiâ divinâ constituat hunce Deum subsistentem, pro quo supponitur ille terminus, Deus acceptus essentialiter.* Valent. *disp.* 2. *qu.* 13.

Secunda sententia referri potest asserens tres perso-

perſonas vere & propriè eſſe unum Deum ratione unius ſubſiſtentis communitèr in Deitate, ablatâ vero ſubſiſtentiâ communi non poſſe tres perſonas dici proprie & ſimplicitèr unum Deum: Sumitur ex Cajetan. *3 p. q. 3. a 6. &* Durand. *in 3. diſt. 1. q. 3.* Richard *art. 1. qu. 5. ratio eſt quia poſitâ ſubſiſtentiâ communi, hoc ſubſiſtens in Deitate eſt hic Deus, qui proprie dicitur Pater, Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ablatâ vero ſubſiſtentiâ non poteſt deſignari in concreto unus numero Deus, qui ſit tres perſonæ.* Suarez *de Trin.* L. 4. C. 12.

Non poteſt admitti quod ſit unum ſuppoſitum commune tribus perſonis, quia hoc eſſet confundere tres perſonas in unam perſonam ſeu hypoſtaſin, unde merito reprehenditur Cajetanus, quod aliquo modo admiſerit unum ſuppoſitum commune tribus perſonis quanquam non ſimpliciter, ſed cum addito id dixerit, ſcilicet ſuppoſitum incompletum vel perſonam incompletam, nam ratio ſuppoſiti repugnat cum communicabilitate divinæ ſubſtantiæ. Suarez *diſput metaphys* 34. *in Deo poteſt eſſe ſubſiſtentia communicabilis.* Ibid.

Poſſumus intelligere hunc Deum *eſſe quid commune tribus perſonis non ſolum ratione naturæ & perſonalitatis confuſè conceptæ, ſed etiam ratione ſubſiſtentiæ communis.* Id. T. 1. *Comment. in* 3 Thom. *diſp.* 11. but of this ſee *Suarez* T. 1. p. 3. diſp. 11. ſect. 3. and *Valentia* againſt it. 1 *p. diſp.* 123. *c.* 3.

Whoever reads the School-men, eſpecially upon

upon theſe Propoſitions, *Deus creat, Deus generat, Deus ſpirat, Deus eſt incarnatus, & Hic Deus* will find them very different and perplexed, and yet all agreeing that the word *Deus* muſt be taken ambiguouſly and equivocally, and not in one adequate and univocal ſenſe, but ſometimes as an univerſal and *communis terminus*, ſometimes ſingularly, ſometimes eſſentially, and ſometimes perſonally, ſometimes abſtractly and ſometimes concretely, ſometimes ſubſtantively and ſometimes adjectively, ſometimes indefinitely and ſometimes preciſely, ſometimes abſolutely eminently and appropriately, and ſometimes particularly and connotatively. Thoſe who are verſed in them cannot be ignorant of this, and that theſe diſtinctions are neceſſary to account for God's being one and three, *Deus unus & trinus*, and to take off the Contradiction of three Gods and one God in the Doctrine of the Trinity.

But not to ſwell and enlarge too much this *Farrago* which I have made ſo, not without deſign, like the Philoſophers *Acroamata*, that while it is underſtood by the Wiſe and Learned, it may not be obnoxious to the Ignorant and Captious *(a)*, upon the beſt Judgment I can make with my little Parts and Reading, having nothing but Truth and Faith before my Eyes: The School-men have perplexed and entangled themſelves and this Doctrine with Endleſs

(a) *Carpere & Detrahere vel imperiti poſſunt, doctorum autem eſt & qui laborantium novere ſudorem vel laſſis manum porrigere, vel errantibus iter oſtendere.* Hieron. in Jon. c. 4.

Difficulties, and run it into ſuch Contradictions as themſelves own would be ſo in any thing elſe (*a*), (as for the ſame thing to be one and three, the ſame and not the ſame, produced and not produced) and have obſcured it with dark and unintelligible (not to ſay falſe) terms, which only amuſe but do not ſatisfie, as real Eſſences diſtinct from ſingular Beings, and Exiſtence without Subſiſtence, and modes of Exiſtence, Subſiſtence, and the like Explications of *Obſcurum per obſcurius*, which are not to be found in any of the Fathers, but only in latter School-men and modern *Metaphyſicks* (*b*), that they have thereby given too much advantage to the *Socinians*, who have been prejudiced and hardned by theſe Scholaſtick

(*a*) *Tenet præterquam in propoſito in divinis, eo quod nuſquam alibi poſſunt eſſe tres res quarum nulla eſt alia quæ tamen ſunt una res numero, ſed tantum in divinis illa reperitur.* Biel *Repetor* L. 1. Diſt. 5. Qu. 1.

Impoſſibile putant unam rem ſingularem eſſe plures res ſicut impoſſibile eſt in creaturâ, —— *& quidem in Creaturis non datur inſtantia, ſed in divinis datur.* Ibid.

Diſtinctionem virtualem in eo formaliſſimè conſiſtere, quòd uni realiter indiviſibili à parte rei & independenter a noſtris conceptibus conveniant prædicata quæ alioquin videtur contradictoria, & quidem in creaturis eſſent contradictoria, —— *in divinis poſſe eandem rem produci & non produci communicari & non communicari quod nulli Creaturæ convenit,* —— *in divinis capacitatem majorem in una indiviſibili re ad habendæ prædicata contradictoria quam in humanis,* —— *quod ſi rationem a priori hujus diſtinctionis quæramus, non aliam poſſumus reddere niſi infinitam perfectionem Dei, ratione cujus in ordine ad aliqua prædicata in ſe oppoſita habet capacitatem ea recipiendi ſimul, perinde ac ſi eſſet multiplex realiter,* —— *fatetur eam æquivalentiam difficulter intelligi, non eſt tamen propterea neganda, eam enim fides, in cujus obſequium debemus captivare intellectum, manifeſte oſtendit.* Arriaga *Tractat. de Myſterio Trinit.* Diſp. 42. Sect. 1.

Eidem indiviſibili rei reſpectu alterius etiam indiviſibilis convenit realiter diſtingui & realiter eſſe idem. Ibid.

Qui non attingunt non aliud non eſſe idem, & non idem non eſſe aliud non poſſunt capere &c. *Cuſan.* in Crib. Alcor. L. 2. C. 8.

(*b*) *Tunc igitur exiſtentia naturæ ſubſtantialis erit completæ terminata quando fuerit affecta modo exiſtendi per ſe, hic ergo modus complet rationem ſubſiſtentiæ creatæ, ille ergo habet propriam rationem perſonalitatis ſeu ſuppoſitalitatis.* Suarez *Diſp. Metaphyſ.* 34.

—— *Poſtquam eſſentia eſt in actu, ſolum indiges*

laſtick Explications againſt the Doctrine it ſelf, ſo that the plaineſt Evidence and Demonſtration of it from Scripture will not perſwade them to believe, what appears ſo unintelligible and unreaſonable as 'tis repreſented to them. The Doctrine ſeems to me, and I hope may to others, even to them at laſt, to be lyable to no ſuch Charge, but to be more plain & eaſie to our Thoughts, (tho' it has many things in it very myſterious and incomprehenſible, both as to the thing and the manner of it) as 'tis propoſed by Revelation, and as 'tis explained by the beſt Antiquity in this manner: An Original, Eternal Mind, with an Eternal λόγος, or ſubſtantial ἔννοια iſſuing from it, and an Eternal Divine Spirit proceeding from both, for the Ancients do not call them τρεῖς νόες, or ψυχαὶ, or τρία πνεύματα, which would repreſent all of them rather as original and abſolute, and not relative and derived from another, as two of them are from one ἀρχὴ πηγὴ, *Principium*, *Fons*, *Origo*, &c. in which they chiefly lay the Divine Unity, but always aſſert

diget modo exiſtendi in ſe & per ſe declaratur ex incarnatione Chriſti, nihil enim aliud intelligimus deeſſe humanitati Chriſti, ut non ſubſiſtat ſubſiſtentiâ propriâ niſi talem exiſtendi modum quo ſit per ſe & non in alio, nam in ea eſt integra omnis eſſentia actualis & creata, & conſequenter eſt etiam ſubſtantialis exiſtentia humanæ naturæ, tamen quia illa exiſtentia ita eſt affecta ut innitatur verbo, a quo ſuſtentatur & pendet, ideo caret illa humanitas modo exiſtendi per ſe, ergo ſolum ex defectu hujuſmodi non eſt ſubſiſtens nec perſona creata, ergo talis modus eſt qui habet rationem perſonalitatis creatæ.

Id quod ſuppoſitum creatum addit ſupra naturam, diſtinguitur quidem in re ab ipſâ naturâ, non tamen omnino realiter tanquam res a re, ſed modaliter, ut modus rei a re.

Eſt ergo ſubſtantia tranſcendenter ſumpta ut diſtinguitur contra accidens (quia non poteſt ſubſtantia ab accidente formaliter accipere ſuum complementum) non tamen entitas ſed modus ſubſtantialis, atq; ita non directe ſed reductive ponitur in prædicamento ſubſtantiæ quia eſt aliquid ſubſtantiale. Suarez *Metaphyſ.* Diſp. 34.

aſſert a real Trinity of τεία ὄντα, πεάγματα, ὑπάρχον-
τα, ἐνυπόςατα, ὑφεςῶτα, ὑφισάμενα, τρεῖς τελείας ὑποςάσεις, τεία
τέλεια πεόσωπα. This is the Explication of the Ancients which they hold with this more plain Scriptural Account of the Trinity, that needs no Explication: One God the Father, with an only begotten Son, (and ſo of the ſame Nature with himſelf) and a Divine Spirit, the Spirit of the Father and the Son (who has Perſonal and Divine Attributes, and Perfections plainly attributed to him) and ſo each of the two latter are God in a true and proper ſence, as *habentes Deitatem & Divinâ Naturâ præditi*, but not unoriginated, or God in that high ſence, as the Father who is Αὐτοθεός, and to whom therefore the term of God and one God, is more peculiarly attributed and even appropriate in the Judgment of the Antients (*a*) and Moderns (*b*). This is the Chriſtian and Catholick Faith, which he that believes with or without, with right or with wrong Explications is undoubtedly Orthodox. The Truth ſeems to lye ſo

(a) *Nam quum id ſit principium cæteris quod ingenitum, Deus ſolus Pater eſt, qui extra originem eſt, ex quo hic eſt qui genitus.* Tertul. ſeu Novatian. *de Trin.*

Deus quidem oſtenditur Filius cui Divinitas tradita & porrecta conſpicitur, & tamen nihilominus unus Deus Pater probatur. Ibid.

Εἰς γαρ θεὸς ἐςὶ καὶ ὐκ ἐσὶν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτου, ὅτι γῶν καὶ μόνος λέγεται ὁ Πατὴρ θεὸς. εἷς γαρ θεὸς μόνος καὶ πρῶτος ἐςιν, ὐκ εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τῦ ἱῦ λέγει ςᾶτα, μὴ γένοιτο, ἐςὶ δὲ ὡς ἴδε πρότυ καὶ μόνα μόνος λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ ἀπάυγισμα ὤν. Athanaſ. *Orat. contra* Arrianos.

Deum in verbo ſuo omnia feciſſe, dum enim Deum audio Patrem cogito. Scotus Erigena *de Diviſ. Naturæ*, L. 1. P. 61.

Habeo libenter & accipio Dei nomine Patrem, Principij Filium Dei, Spiritus Dei Spiritum Sanctum ſignificatos. Ibid.

(b) *Peculiariter & κατ' ἐξοχὴν tribuitur Patri Dei nomen.* Ravanel. *biblioth.* v. *Deus & Perſona.*

Cæterum Attributionem ſeu Appropriationem ut vocant nominis Deus omnes in Scriptura pie ac prudenter

ſo plain, that I wonder any ſhould miſs it, I have picked it up where others have over looked it: It is generally obſerved to lye between contending Parties. The *Socinians*, eſpecially *Crellius*, inſiſt very much upon the Scriptural Notion of One God the Father: The *Antients* alſo do this, as I have ſhown, but not excluſively to the Divinity of Son and Holy Ghoſt, as the others have done very Erroneouſly and Heretically. The School men miſt this plain Notion, whilſt they carefully maintain the other, but run into a Labyrinth of Subtleties and Difficulties about One's being Three, and Three One, and weave an artificial cloudy Net-work of thin but dark Cobwebs, ſuch as Real Univerſals, Subſtantial Modes, Subſiſtent Relations, Unſubſiſtent Exiſtencies, Concrete Perſonal Properties, *&c.* that thro' it One Being may look and appear as Three, and yet be One; and to avoid the Objection of Three Gods, which they need not have been puzled with, if they had hit right upon that of One, according to Scripture and Antiquity, they make three diſtinct Subſiſtencies, and but one diſtinct Subſiſtent, Three oppoſite Modes and Relations, and but one Subject of them, Three Divine Perſons,

denter exercitati facile animadvertunt. — Appropriatio autem omnino in eo ſita eſt, quod vox Deus quæ cæteroquin pluribus numero perſonis eſt communis, tanquam unius nempe Patris propria ſumatur. Biſterfield *contra* Crel. *L.* 1. P. 41.

Nonne in hoc regno ſolus Condæus abſolutè princeps dicitur, idq; elogium pro ejus nomine proprio ſæpiſſimè ponitur cum alij. —— Exemplum in quo Attributum commune uni tantum ex illis ita rectè tribuitur ut dicere ei ſoli competere. — Placæus *contra* Crell. P. 33.

ſons, and but One Divine Being; Three Somewhats, and but One Thing. My hearty Zeal and Concern for the Honour of Chriſtianity, and my deep Regret to ſee its Faith thus Mangled and Perverted, and my Pity to ſee ſo many groping for the Light at Noon-day, and looking ſo carefully for what they have in their hands, has made me venture to ſhow that which I wonder I did not always ſee, and I hope others may do the ſame.

Some Remarks of the Fathers upon *Sabellianiſm*, and the wrong and Jewiſh Notion of One God which it held, and from whence it aroſe.

Simplices enim quique me dixerim imprudentes, & idiotæ, quæ major ſemper credentium pars eſt, quoniam & ipſa regula fidei à pluribus Deis ſæculi ad Unicum & verum Deum transfert, non intelligentes unicum quidem ſed cum ſuâ œconomiâ eſſe credendum, expaveſcunt ad œconomiam, numerum & diſpoſitionem Trinitatis. Diviſionem præſumunt unitatis, quando unitas ex ſemetipſâ derivatus Trinitatem, non deſtruatur ab illâ ſed adminiſtretur. Itaque duos & tres jam jactitant à nobis prædicari, ſe vero unius Dei cultores præſumunt, quaſi non & unitas irrationaliter collecta Hereſin faciat? & Tri-

nitas

nitas rationaliter expensa veritatem constituat. Tertul. adv. Praxeam.

Χωριζόμεθα τῶν Ἰουδαϊζόντων καὶ Χριστιανισμὸν ἐν Ἰουδαϊσμῷ παραθεωροῦσιν, οἱ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν ἀρνούμενοι, θεὸν ἕνα παραπλησίως Ἰουδαίοις λέγουσιν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς μόνον ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ νοσοῦντες περὶ θεότητα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φαίσκοντες ἀνὴρ εἶναι μόνον θεὸν, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἄλογον ὕβριν καὶ ἀκέραιον λύσσαν ζῶντες. Athanaſ. contra Sabellij Gregales.

Οἱ γὰρ τριάδα μονάδα ποιοῦντες, νοθεύειν τὴν ἀπορρητον ὥσπερ τὴν γέννησιν ἐπιχειροῦσιν, εἰσὶ γὰρ ὅντα φασὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν, ἀμαιμάκτῳ ἀνθρώπου ἐρριζωμένον, ἢ ἔστιν, αὐτὸν τὸν ὄν καὶ μόνον θεὸν, ἕλως ἀπορράλθαι πρὸς ἀνθρωπον, ἢ θεὸν παρὰ θεοῦ. Ibid.

Ἰουδαϊσμός ἐστιν ὁ Σαβελλισμὸς, ἐν παραγράμματι Χριστιανισμοῦ τῷ εὐαγγελικῷ κηρύγματι ἐπεισαγόμενος· ὁ γὰρ ἐν πρόσωπα πολυώνυμον λέγων πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ μιὰν τῶν τριῶν τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐκλαθόμενος, τί ἄλλο ποιεῖ ἢ ἀρνεῖται μὲν τὴν πρωτοτόκου τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ὑπαρξιν, ἀρνεῖται δὲ καὶ τὴν οἰκονομικὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδημίαν. Basil Epiſt. 64. ad Neocæſar.

Ὥσπερ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς οὐσίας μὴ ὁμολογῶν εἰς πολυθεΐαν ἐμπίπτει, οὕτως ὁ τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν ὑποστάσεων μὴ διδοὺς, εἰς τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἀποφέρεται. Ibid.

Οὐ γὰρ ἐξαιρεῖ διαφορὰς προσώπων ἀναιρῶν σαβέλλιος, ἀλλὰ χρὴ ἑκάστῳ προσώπῳ, ἀν ὑποστάσει ἀληθινῇ ὑπάρχειν ὁμολογεῖν, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἀνυπόστατον τῶν προσώπων ἀναπλασμὸν ἐδεῖ ὁ Σαβέλλιος παρεπιπλοκαλο. Ibid.

Οἱ δὲ τὸν ἐν θεῷ θεὸν λόγον ἀρνούμενοι καὶ ὀρθόμαπι μὲν ὁμολογοῦντες ὄνομα, ἔργῳ δὲ καὶ ἀληθεία τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἀθετοῦντες τὸν Ἰουδαισμὸν πάλιν ἀναπεῦνται. Id. contra Sabel. & Arr.

Σαβελλίου γὰρ ἀνάλυσιν καὶ τὴν σύγχυσιν, καὶ τὴν ἵν ὕτως εἰπω κατάπτωσιν τὰ τρία συναιροῦντος εἰς ἕν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτοις ὑφεστῶτα τὸ ἓν ἀεὶ ζοντος. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 25.

Μηδὲ εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν, συναιρεθέντα τὸν Λόγον δεῖ Πολυθεΐας — εἰς Ἰουδαϊκὴν πνοίαν καταλεανθῆναι, καὶ φθόνον ἐπεισαγαγεῖν τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, ἀσπὴρ ἀνελκόντας μὴ διαφθείρεσθαι ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς πατὴρ ὢν ἀληθινῶς καὶ ὁμοπάμων ἴδιον φύσιν, Id. Orat. 1.

Διὰ τὸ ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ εἶναι, μὴ ἕν τι ὂν ἐν ἀριθμῷ νοεῖσθαι, ὅ ποτὲ μὲν πατὴρ, ποτὲ δὲ υἱὸς λέγεται, ἀλλὰ οὕτως ὑφεστῶτα πατέρα, καὶ ὑφεστῶτα υἱὸν, Cyrill Alexandrin. in Theſauro, p. 109.

It

It was *Sabellius* his plauſible and twitting Queſtion; ἕνα θεὸν ἔχομεν ἢ Ἰοεῖς θεὸς? Epiphan. Hereſ. 62. Thus *Noetus* gloried in his being an Unitarian, ἕνα θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ἐπίσαμαι καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον πλὴν αὐτόν, Id. Hereſ. 57. But the Father calls him ἀνόσιον for thoſe Reaſons, which are a Demonſtration againſt his Opinion of One Being; πῶς γὰρ εἶπε Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, πάντως ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν καὶ γεγέννηται, εἰ δὲ παῦλος ἐστιν, ἑαυτὸν γεννᾶν ἀδύνατον, πάλιν γὰρ τὸ καλούμενον οὐχ ἑαυτὸν οὐκ ἐγέννησεν, ἀλλὰ οὐ παῦλος γεγέννηται. Epiphan. Ibid.

They brought all the places of Scripture for One God againſt the Real Trinity, as others do ſince, and run into their Error, to avoid Tritheiſm. Ἀλλὰ τί φάσκεις ὦ δύσμορε; μὴ πολυθεΐαν ὑφήσουσιν οἱ τὰ εἰρέσεως ἦν τεύξει περιφερόμενοι ὄλιγοι ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς μόνης καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Epiph. Ibid.

From all which it is plain, and will be plainer to thoſe who read theſe Authors at large, that it is Heretical to believe One God in a *Jewiſh* and *Sabellian* (I may add now in a *Mahometan* and *Socinian*) Senſe, as well as Three Gods in a *Gentile* and *Pagan*, or *Marcionite* and *Valentinian*; and that Chriſtianity is between thoſe Extreams, believing One God the Father, a Son, who is God begotten of him, and a Holy Ghoſt, who is God proceeding from both. I conclude with a Quotation which the Learned Reader will underſtand the full Purport of: Ἐὰν τὸ θεὸς ὄνομα πρόσωπον δηλαστικὸν ὑπάρχῃ, τότε πρόσωπα λέγοντες τῆς θεότητος Ἰοεῖς ἂν ἐλέγομεν θεοὺς, εἰ δὲ θεὸς ὄνομα οὐσίας σημαντικόν ἐστι, μίαν ἔσται ὁμολογοῦντες τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ἕνα θεὸν εἰπόντες δοξάζομεν. Greg. Nyſſen. adv. Gre. T. 2. p. 82.

FINIS.

Advertiſement.

THE *Reader is deſired to add theſe words which were omitted*, p. 20. *lin. ult.* No way contrary to that of the Church of *England*, I am as well——— *Many other Errata's having ſlipt correction, the Reader is deſired to excuſe and amend.*

☞ Three Sermons of the Author, in *Octavo*, finiſhed before his Death, will be Publiſhed in a few days.